The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XLII FEBRUARY 1956 NUMBER 1

AUDEN'S "SEPTEMBER 1, 1939": AN INTERPRETER'S ANALYSIS

Daphne Nicholson Bennett

I

IN London, England, in 1947, Richard Church and other judges at the Verse Speaking Festival made the point that there were many young people who had beautifully trained voices and fine techniques but who did not appear to understand the poems which they were speaking. A plea was made that developing understanding should not be neglected in the training of the oral interpreter of literature. This plea is not new, and it has been reiterated many times.

Another kind of plea is made by Marvin T. Herrick in the United States when he stresses that it is important for teachers of literature to learn to read well.[1] Gerald E. Marsh points out that there is a growing awareness among professors of English of the need for increased ability on the part of their students to read aloud the literature which they have analyzed on paper.[2] Marsh's main concern, however, is that interpretation should be recognized as a worth-while part of the offerings of the Speech department. He says: "It must stand second to none in the broad division of Fine Arts. It has not always enjoyed such status, partly because of prejudices on the part of stronger, well-intrenched departments of English, partly because of its own superficial treatment of literature." He adds: ". . . an interpretative approach to speech requires teachers who are equipped to teach interpretation well. . . . If outstanding teachers can be found, interpretation will receive the kind of recognition it deserves."

The two demands which emerge with strong emphasis from the foregoing quotations are for improved skill in oral reading on the part of the teacher and student of English and for a more profound study of literature on the part of the oral interpreter within the field of Speech. Despite widespread recogni-

Daphne Nicholson Bennett (Ph.D., University of Southern California, 1955), currently an assistant in the Speech Department at the University of Southern California, was formerly in charge of the Speech and Drama program at Dudley College, University of Birmingham, England. She came to the United States in 1950 as a Fulbright Lecturer and has traveled widely as a speaker both in England and the United States.

[1] Marvin T. Herrick, "The Teacher as Reader and Interpreter of Literature," *QJS*, XLI (April 1955), 110-113.

[2] Gerald E. Marsh, "An Interpretative Approach to Speech," *QJS*, XL (October 1954), 269-271.

tion of the need for training in literary appreciation for students of oral interpretation, Wallace A. Bacon points out that there is still considerable lack of such training; he emphasizes that ". . . an enormous amount of work remains for us to do."[3]

Many English departments have not yet made use of modern criticism as a vital part of the study of literature; the biographical-historical approach in the tradition of German scholarship is still predominant over the critical approach which stresses a close study of the text and an evaluation of its artistic merit. Probably in no field more than in oral interpretation, however, is attention to the text of the work of supreme importance, and any service which modern criticism can do for the oral interpreter in helping him to know the poem on many levels of acquaintance would appear to be of great value. A good deal has been written in recent years on the new criticism and its relevance to oral interpretation. Don Geiger's penetrating and comprehensive accounts have been notable in covering many problems which concern the literary critic and the oral interpreter.[4]

That there are differences among critics is abundantly true, and to the more exclusive partisans the differences cannot be reconciled. A follower of F. R. Leavis, for example, might find it very difficult to be a follower of anyone else. But there are probably far more points of agreement among the majority of the critics than there are points of radical disagreement. For example, the differences may simply be those of words rather than ideas, as when T. S. Eliot speaks of the pure language of the metaphysical poets and means much the same as Robert Penn Warren when the latter postulates the need for an impure poem: both writers indicate that nothing should be legislated out of poetry, that its language should draw from the common pot of language spoken at the time.[5] Modern critics widely agree that the meaning of words in a poem is contextual. The complex patterning of those words in the text and their use in poetic images give them new meanings. "The poet must become . . . more allusive, more indirect, in order to force, to dislocate if necessary, language into his meaning."[6] And Maxfield Parrish emphasizes the fundamental importance for oral reading of understanding the meaning of a word, a phrase, a sentence, not only in themselves but in the context of the whole composition.[7]

Yet there is another sense, of course, in which a poem cannot be paraphrased. Meanings are multiple. As Richards points out, no paraphrase is equal to the thing said in the poem.[8] Archibald MacLeish indicates much the same thought in his "Ars Poetica":

> A poem should not mean
> But be.

For the oral interpreter the nearest approach to the "being" of the poem would be the total empathic response to it after the poem has been given the

[3] Wallace A. Bacon, "Scholarship and the Interpreter," *QJS*, XXXIX (April 1953), 187-192.

[4] "A 'Dramatic' Approach to Interpretative Analysis," *QJS*, XXXVIII (April 1952), 189-194; "Oral Interpretation in the Liberal Arts Context," *QJS*, XL (April 1954), 137-144; "Pluralism in the Interpreter's Search for Sanctions," *QJS*, XLI (February 1955), 43-56.

[5] T. S. Eliot, "The Metaphysical Poets," in *Homage to John Dryden; Three Essays on Poetry of the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1924), pp. 24-33; Robert Penn Warren, "Pure and Impure Poetry," in *Kenyon Review;* see *Kenyon Critics; Studies in Modern Literature*, ed. John Crowe Ransom (Cleveland, 1951), pp. 17-42.

[6] Eliot, *Homage to John Dryden*, p. 31.

[7] Wayland Maxfield Parrish, *Reading Aloud: A Technique in the Interpretation of Literature* (New York, 1937).

[8] I. A. Richards, "The Bridle of Pegasus," in *Critiques and Essays in Criticism*, ed. Robert Wooster Stallman (New York, 1949), pp. 289-314.

close study which will elucidate its meaning and its aesthetic value.

But these are speculative points.

In the use of modern criticism in the service of the oral interpretation of literature, particularly of poetry, one valuable approach for teacher and student would be to apply specific critical essays to any literary work which aptly embodies the problems raised by the essays. The critical principles involved can more thoroughly be grasped in the critical practice of them than in any other way.

This paper proposes to evaluate a specific poem by dealing with certain problems raised by the literary theorist. It is one example of the ways in which the principles of literary criticism can be used to deepen an appreciation of aesthetic theory as well as of the poetry they subserve. Theory can thus be a powerful agent in understanding a given work.

That a more profound appreciation of the unity of content and form comes from the most strenuous analysis of a work of art is an assumption that can only be verified in the actual practice of criticism and in the acquisition of tools of evaluation. However, while the discriminating assessment of a literary work can increase enjoyment of it, a better oral rendering does not automatically follow. Literary analysis provides a deeper understanding as a result of which a more meaningful oral interpretation can be given; but the discipline of oral reading has to be mastered also, before meaningful oral interpretation can take place. This is not to suggest a dichotomy. The literary analysis and the oral interpretation of the literary work go together. However, in the interests of making clarifying distinctions about the work of art, organically inseparable aspects of form and content may be dealt with separately; likewise, questions of literary discipline and oral interpretation may be treated separately. Moreover, to acquire the discipline of a more profound scrutiny of literature, such separateness of treatment might be necessary for the student. But, let it be emphasized, the understanding and the speaking are a unity, not a dichotomy. Many of the problems referred to above have arisen because the two have been separated, compartmentalized, and even departmentalized. Our aim as interpreters is to bring them together in a more than superficial sense, and in more than the mechanical application of literary or technical formulae. The separate treatment of the literary and oral problems in this paper is simply a device used to the end of a deeper union of the two. It is a valuable teaching approach also. The whole body eventually swims, but much separate practice of arms and legs goes into the total achievement.

In an age in which literature has become a source book for the sociologist, and when many writers—dramatists, novelists, and poets alike—are beset by the imminent problems of man's survival as a civilized human being, certain questions raised by Edmund Wilson and R. P. Blackmur appear particularly relevant.[9] It might be of some interest to the critic-interpreter to consider what they have to say in relation to such a keenly "social poet" as W. H. Auden, since I propose to confine my present discussion to one of Auden's poems and to evaluate some of the issues involved in the interpretation of his work.

The problems raised by Wilson and Blackmur are relevant to much of Au-

[9] Edmund Wilson, "Historical Criticism," and R. P. Blackmur, "The Enabling Act of Criticism," in Stallman, *op. cit.*, pp. 449-459 and 412-417.

den and other poets whose poetic experience is vitally situated in the contemporary scene. We are, of course, faced with an old problem in new guise —the place of a primarily didactic approach as opposed to a more universal treatment of the object in which the "moral" or the "propaganda" inherently present is a by-product of an aesthetic experience and not the major and direct concern of the work.

The section which follows deals with certain specific problems of literary theory as they appear in Auden's "September 1, 1939."[10] In the third section some questions related to the oral interpretation of this poem will be discussed.

II

In considering the relevance of historical criticism and the importance of extra-literary interests in judging a literary work, we find ourselves again with the problems of origins (social milieux, biography of the author, and so on) and the problems of messages (what the poem does) as against the immediate reality of the work itself.

There are certain elements in the essays of Blackmur and Wilson which for our purposes we must omit from discussion. For instance, there is the point made by Blackmur that greatness in literature is recognized by other than literary standards, and there is Wilson's indecisive discussion of the "elite" as the "highly organized reader" who can know good literature when he sees it. These questions are outside our territory. Nor is it the purpose of this paper to criticize Wilson's slipping into the affective fallacy, in the extreme bypaths of which the poem tends to disappear, while the critic, according to Wimsatt and Beardsley, gives testimony to his own personalized emotional reactions.[11]

We must narrow our concern to the consideration of the relevance of historical and extra-literary criticism in appreciating literature.

Blackmur is concerned with the culture complex. The whole mind is the product of the whole culture, and therefore "other interests," such as the moral, political, and spiritual, are imaginatively present in literature. Wilson makes a similar point in quoting Herder, who says that poetry is Protean because the poet is constantly responding to changes in languages, manners, habits and temperaments. As Wilson puts it, when speaking of historical criticism, "The writer must find expression for something which has never yet been expressed, master a new set of phenomena which has never yet been mastered." Wilson adds: "Some writers . . . have a different kind of explicit message beyond the kind of reassurance implicit in merely understanding life or in the harmony of artistic form."

Both Wilson and Blackmur stress, however, the need for the critic to pay attention to the primary aspect of literature. It is that primary aspect in which literature, to use Blackmur's words, "represents the experience of the actual which is beneath and beyond merely moral experience and which alone grounds or situates moral experience." Whatever "use" literature may have, Blackmur points out, comes through the whole imaginative grasp of it, and it is necessary to approach "those other in-

[10] The writer wishes to thank Mr. Cleanth Brooks for the opportunity and encouragement he gave her in developing the central ideas in the literary section of this paper during the course of work she did with him in the theory of poetry. "September 1, 1939" from *Another Time* by W. H. Auden is reprinted in connection with the present discussion by the kind permission of Random House, Inc.

[11] W. K. Wimsatt, Jr., and Monroe C. Beardsley, "The Affective Fallacy," in Stallman, *op. cit.*, pp. 401-411.

terests through the interests of the works themselves," and those interests are "in the words and the motions of the words." Wilson makes the same point when he says that, after attention has been given to the Freudian psychological, Marxist economic, racial, and geographic factors, and to factors of biography and history, there still remain the problems of comparative artistic value. The relative degrees of success in the work of art have to be estimated.

Auden's poem, "September 1, 1939," was inspired by a historical incident, the declaration of war, an event which had global significance. The poem expresses Auden's feelings and thoughts arising from this historical event.

The immediate scene and the poet's immediate feelings in reaction to the declaration of war are given in the first stanza. Sitting in a "dive on Fifty Second Street," he is "uncertain and afraid." The "clever hopes" of a "low dishonest decade" are expiring. Thus, early in the poem he establishes a viewpoint. "Clever" implies in context the trickery and manipulation of the "dishonest decade" as the poet sees it. Then the poet by implication identifies himself with all men in the world: "our private lives" (not just "my" private life) are being obsessed by "waves of anger and fear." By implication, too, it is the whole earth and all men who are involved—both the "bright and darkened lands," where it is day and where it is night. Thus, the inescapability of the anger and fear "obsessing our private lives" is early brought out.

> The unmentionable odour of death
> Offends the September night.

Civilization is threatened. The phrase, "One of the dives on Fifty Second Street" has its implicit ironical comment, too, if this is one of the loci of the civilization which the war must save.

In stanza two, the poet continues a search for the causes of the contemporary situation. "Accurate scholarship" is able to "unearth the whole offence"—even the obscurities of Linz. But, after all, he comments, what accurate scholarship here unearths is really part of common knowledge: evil will produce evil.

Extra-literary knowledge will considerably elucidate this second stanza. The poet draws from psychology and sociology. The link between Luther and now (Nazism)—the "offence" which drove a "culture mad," the "huge imago" which made a "psychopathic god"—is the authoritarian conscience. The analysis of history implicit here would appear to be that given in such a book as *Flight from Freedom* by Erich Fromm, who says:

> To understand the dynamics of the social process we must understand the dynamics of the sociological processes operating within the individual, just as to understand the individual we must see him in the context of the culture which moulds him.[12]

Fromm points out that freedom from the authoritarian church at the time of the Renaissance and Reformation left men with a sense of powerlessness and helplessness—a kind of negative freedom from which they sought release. So, with the Reformation, there came a new kind of authoritarianism—submission to a tyrannical god. Fromm employs Freudian terminology in the analysis of historical processes: Luther and Calvin, he says, projected their hostility onto the deity. It is in such a context that Auden uses the term "imago" (conception of the parent retained in the Unconscious) and applies it to the contemporary social problem. He wonders what "huge imago" made God as psychopathic as the authoritarian Lutheran god—or the Nazi mystique of state—for it is the same "flight from freedom"

[12] Erich Fromm, *Flight from Freedom* (New York, 1941), p. viii.

which is seen in the acceptance of totalitarianism by people "uncertain and afraid." Stanza two thus points to one kind of solution for the insecure individual of stanza one: he can submit to tyranny. Such submission embodies a kind of "faith": a conviction of being "loved" if as a precondition there is total surrender of personal freedom. But such a belief, the poet implies, has "driven a culture mad." This concept links stanza two with stanza six where the dangers of it are pointed up in the context of personal relationships.

> What *mad* Nijinsky wrote
> About Diaghilev. (Italics mine)

Diaghilev wanted to monopolize Nijinsky and have full control of his career; he even dismissed him by cable when he dared to marry while he was in Buenos Aires. Thus, the type of love which demands possession and complete surrender presumably made Nijinsky mad as it makes a culture mad. The craving for possession of another, often expressed paradoxically in submission, too, is "true of the normal heart."

The poet ranges, but he ranges connectedly.

In stanza three Auden turns from modern scholarship to the first great deliberate analyzer of historical processes in the cultural history of the West. Thucydides said that his *History of the Peloponnesian War* was for those who desire "an exact knowledge of the past as a key to the future which in all probability will repeat or resemble the past."[13] The feeling that a thing has happened before, that "we must suffer it all again," is placed in a meaningful context and related historically to early Greek speeches about democracy; the implication is that Thucydides knew "the elderly rubbish" talked by dictators, that the situation was essentially the same then as now.

Stanza four is devoted to the economic viewpoint. The poet turns to the contemporary scene. One implication of the stanza is that, despite Thucydides and his wisdom of more than two thousand years, we are still divided. The "blind sky-scrapers"

> proclaim
> The strength of Collective man.

They are the symbol of what can be done by co-operation, and yet, it is implied, competition holds sway as

> Each language pours its vain
> Competitive excuse.

But the languages talk into the "neutral air." In other words, no side is taken, and so, by implication, their excuses are vain. It is by suggestion, not by dogmatic statement, that the poet points an indicting finger. The link between "competition," "imperialism," and the "international wrong" is implicit, even though dependent on external knowledge. According to the economic analysis, competition leads to conflict for markets, to imperialism, to the international wrong (the kind of wrong manifest in the present war); and these facts stare out of the mirror. In other words, as anyone looking into the mirror will see himself, so the responsibility for looking is universal and not confined to one person or one nation. The poet has thus successfully suggested his point through the poetic image.

Stanza five sums up the kind of escapes people resort to in order to avoid facing unpleasant reality. They cling to the familiar things of the average day which serve to distract attention from their essential lostness. In describing these small everyday things, the poet uses implicit contrast with the big issues demanding attention in the previous stanza.

[13] R. C. Jebb, "Thucydides," in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 9th ed.

The vain endeavors of people in private and in public to be their own masters is the substance of stanza seven.

In stanza eight the threads are drawn together into a credo. The poet has only his "voice" to counteract the "folded lie" portrayed in the previous stanzas—the illusion of the sensual man-in-the-street, the deceptive symbol of the buildings of Authority, only seemingly demonstrating a collective strength which man does not show elsewhere. The conclusion is that there is no choice between death and loving one another—in the universal sense of the brotherhood of man as implied by stanza six. The methods of indirection are at work in the poem as a whole as well as in its parts. Thus, the "lie of authority" in stanza eight suggests the false symbol of the buildings in stanza four. They are an ironical symbol of what men can do together, for they belie their promise: men remain divided. This meaning is pointed up structurally as the main facets of the problem are brought together in stanza eight. This interconnected focusing of meaning is an example of Auden's method.

The poet ends on a personal note as he began. Returning to himself in the context of world disaster, he identifies himself with the Just whose "messages exchanged" are imagined as "ironic points of light" in the general darkness. But he does not cut himself off from the "sensual man in the street" either. This man also—as well as the other—is composed of "Eros and the dust" and beleaguered by "the same negation and despair." In fact, he identifies himself with humanity, as he has dramatically identified himself with each view presented, whether that of Thucydides or of escapists pursuing their average day, and these imaginative identifications are a source of dramatic power. In the tensions between the viewpoints there is dramatic conflict, and within the structure of the poem Auden has dramatized his position. In contrast to the feelings of uncertainty and fear in the first stanza, after following through his thoughts and feelings, he is impelled to affirmation, "to show an affirming flame." In what Blackmur calls "the words and the motions of the words" he has succeeded in focusing the actual and pointing out his own position in relation to the world and the historical background. Thus the poem is not just an analysis of history, although the impetus to write it came from a profound need to search for meaning in the historical situation, and although historical analysis is in the tissue of the poem. But the important thing is that it is in the tissue so that a poem and not a mere propaganda piece emerges. Within the poem, to use Edmund Wilson's words, "the disorder has been resolved, the anomaly subjected to discipline."

There is, however, much to be said on the other side. It could be argued that a few "tags" like "imago," "psychopathic god," "Collective Man," "imperialism" and so on are too slender to carry the weight of these complex analyses of history. The connections between stanza two and stanza six suggested above might be used as an example of a reading in of meanings from external knowledge, from the "extra-literary interests," as Blackmur calls them. However, the text would seem to point up the sociological analysis outlined above with regard to stanza two—the flight from freedom to authority and its manifestations—although external knowledge provides a resource which is illuminating. One might say that all literature as well as all communication of any kind draws upon the varied knowledge which has become part of the culture.

But in the context of a poem familiar language takes on new connotations as words are combined in patterns and images which subserve the meaning of the poem.

Auden might be criticized for much question-begging use of epithets and phrases—"low dishonest decade," "elderly rubbish," "militant trash." But there is also a sense in which these very tags are being dramatically used or ironically quoted. They are not direct propagandist phrases. The poem must stand as a poem first—for even if a poem embodies a doctrine compelling in its truth, the truth of a doctrine will not save it as a poem. Message hunting, whether in the Victorian or Marxist tradition, is not relevant to the evaluation of a poem as a work of art.

There is a rich and tangled problem here, and approaches to the poem can merely be suggested.

"September 1, 1939" does not stand or fall by the validity of its historical criticism, though this is searching and extensive and worthy of attention, embodying as it does the key problems of our civilization. If it is charged that too much external knowledge is required to understand its references, it can also be at least tentatively replied that the modern breakdown of the homogeneity that used to exist in the cultural equipment of the educated person is as much at fault as the poet. Here probably lies one reason for the development of criticism. Eliot says, "The important moment for the appearance of criticism seems to be the time when poetry ceases to be the expression of the mind of a whole people."[14]

Brooks said of Auden that he possibly represents "the sensibility fortified with principles, or, perhaps, changing the viewpoint, the sensibility at the mercy of a set of principles, working for a cause."[15] In the present poem it can be said of Auden's thought, as Eliot said of Donne, that "A thought for him was an experience: it modified his sensibility."[16] The poem has too what Hulme called the "zest" in the "contemplation" of a thing, the zest which "carries on the contemplator to accurate description," and "there you have sufficient justification for poetry."[17]

Through the structure, through "the words and the motions of the words," to return to Blackmur's criterion, the poet has succeeded in focusing what he has to say as "his unified mind and sensibility are engaged in an act of understanding." The anthropologists, beginning with Malinowski in the early years of this century, have demonstrated that culture is an interdependent unity satisfying many aspects of human needs. As "the whole mind is the product of the whole culture," in Blackmur's phrase, so this poem is a unity of interrelated observations using much of the methods of indirection, as the poet responds to the cultural situation of which he is a part and seeks for meaning in man's position in a world of war.

III

Beginning with the assumption of the literary analysis, the oral interpreter then pays attention to the primary aspect of literature. Whatever other interests are present in the poem, those other interests are, as Blackmur says, to be approached "through the interests of

[14] T. S. Eliot, *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1933), p. 12.

[15] Cleanth Brooks, *Modern Poetry and the Tradition* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939), p. 125.

[16] T. S. Eliot, "The Metaphysical Poets," in *Homage to John Dryden*, p. 30.

[17] T. E. Hulme, "Romanticism and Classicism," in *Speculations; Essays on Humanism and the Philosophy of Art* (London, 1924), p. 136.

the works themselves," and those interests are "in the words and the motions of the words." It is through the whole imaginative grasp of the literary work that what it has to say can be said, and it will be the aim of the interpreter to achieve the unity of interrelated observations which is the poem.

To begin with, a frame of reference, a viewpoint, must be assumed. In the poem "September 1, 1939" the attitude of the poet is one of ironic contemplation as he seeks for meaning in man's position in a world of war. He is neither hortatory nor didactic. He is not addressing an audience directly to persuade them or harangue them. He is dramatizing and resolving his position through an imaginative identification between it and a variety of conflicting positions which are structurally focused upon his. To achieve this end the interpreter must have a sufficient aesthetic distance both from the objects in the poem and from the audience, if he is to avoid the pitfalls of direct propaganda, of an overemphatic manner, which would be more in keeping with a moralistic commentary than with an expression of what Blackmur calls "experience of the actual which is beneath or beyond merely moral experience and which alone grounds or situates moral experience." The general set for the speaking of the poem needs to be in keeping with a literary analysis which points to the poem as primarily a poem and not a tract.

Only a scrupulous attention to detail, however, will achieve an apt oral interpretation of the work.

It is not proposed in the space of this paper to deal with actual techniques for improving voice or articulation, of varying or controlling pace, or aptly using inflections, or of rendering parenthetical phrases. These points are excellently covered in books and courses in school and college curricula.

As my literary analysis discussed ways in which meanings were focused in the structure of the poem, in this section of the paper I discuss ways in which oral interpretation can honor the structure and the literary analysis by means of a proper consideration of the question of emphasis.

Anyone with a knowledge of the phonetics of English knows that the "throwing away" of weak forms—which includes many uses of the preposition and article—is as important for meaning and language rhythm as the stressing of strong forms. This principle equally applies for the speaking of prose or poetry. In addition, poetry has its own unique kinds of emphasis inherent in the meter and the pattern of the verse: the shape of the poem, in other words, points up its meaning, if the poem is successful. Thus the end of the line, with its slight form pause, and the metrical beat, are places where there is some focusing of attention. Rhyme provides another vehicle for emphasizing meaning, while the stanza form conveys one whole idea in a "verse paragraph." The verse paragraphs are linked as interconnected parts of the whole theme. Without losing the basic pattern of the poem, the interpreter sees that variety in phrasing and stress, in keeping with meaningful rendering, is the most important aspect of speaking it successfully.

The main task of the oral interpreter is to place the right emphasis on words in terms of his understanding of the poem. It is the placing of major stress that concerns him primarily. This one matter—the interpreter's emphasis, his stress—is the concern of this final section of my paper. Primary stress will be the general descriptive name for the

placing of major emphasis. The lesser emphasis which falls on words by virtue of meter or verse pattern in combination with meaning will be called secondary stress. If the primary stress is well placed, the secondary stress will take care of itself and the dangers of overemphasis will tend to be avoided. Moreover, problems of phrasing—the putting together of words which belong together—will to a large extent be solved. Pauses will tend to fall meaningfully also; heavy stress not only slows down pace but can create a temporary standstill if the meaning dictates a wait.

At no time, of course, must the placing of stress violate the metrical form.

It would be useful for the student to write the whole poem in phonetic script, thereby accurately indicating both secondary and primary stress, and strong and weak forms.

The primary emphasis in the first stanza would run as follows:

I. 1 I sit in one of the dives
2 On Fifty Second Street
3 *Uncertain* and *afraid*
4 As the clever hopes expire
5 Of a low dishonest decade:
6 Waves of *anger* and *fear*
7 Circulate over the bright
8 And darkened lands of the earth
9 *Obsessing* our *private* lives;
10 The unmentionable odour of *death*
11 *Offends* the September night.

In the literary analysis of the first stanza of the poem I noted the possibly implicit ironic comment in the fact that the poet was sitting in a dive—a locus of the civilization that the war must save. But this is not the major subject of the stanza. The metrical beat and the end of the line make the word sufficiently emphatic. Neither the first nor the second line should have major stress. The secondary stress should be left to take care of itself in the fourth and fifth lines also, unless a finger-wagging overemphasis in violation of the tone of the poem is to result. *Uncertain* and *afraid* are the only words to receive major emphasis in the first five lines. Primary stress should also fall on *anger* and *fear* in line six, words closely linked with the conveying of uneasiness out of which the poet seeks for his answers. No word needs primary stress in lines seven and eight. The phrasing itself sufficiently locates the bright and darkened lands—the global aspect of the war. *Obsessing* and *private* should be marked for stress in line nine as there is a strong focus of meaning here: the global problem *obsesses* our *private* lives. *Death* and *offends* are the only words to receive major emphasis in terms of the meaning in the last two lines.

Stanza two contains reference to historical and "extra-literary" interests which the oral rendering should not make to stick out, but should absorb into the tissue of the verse, in keeping with the conclusions arrived at in the exegesis of the poem.

II. 1 Accurate scholarship can
2 *Unearth* the *whole offence*
3 From Luther until now
4 That has driven a culture *mad*,
5 Find what occurred at Linz,
6 What huge imago made
7 A *psychopathic god:*
8 I and the public *know*
9 What all school children learn,
10 Those to whom *evil* is done
11 *Do* evil in *return.*

The contrast is between *unearthing* the causes of the trouble and *knowing* them already, not between *accurate scholarship* and the *public.* Neither Luther nor the obscurities of Linz need particular emphasis, if the main idea is to shine through. *Mad* should be stressed, and the interpreter should be aware of the link with "mad Nijinsky" and the "normal heart" in stanza six. *Psychopathic god* should possibly be

stressed—the big word in contrast to the simple common knowledge that evil begets evil.

In the third stanza the idea is carried still further that unearthing knowledge of causes is discovering nothing new.

III. 1 *Exiled Thucydides* knew
2 *All* that a speech can *say*
3 About *Democracy*
4 And what *dictators* do,
5 The elderly rubbish they talk
6 To an apathetic grave;
7 *Analysed* all in his book,
8 The enlightenment driven away,
9 The habit-forming pain,
10 Mismanagement and grief:
11 We must suffer them *all again*.

Knew will not receive primary stress in the first line as the word *know* has already been introduced and emphasized. *Exiled* is the key word in this line, and *Thucydides* will partake of the stress of *exiled*. The fact that Thucydides was exiled with all his knowledge is the important concept. Again, the historical knowledge needs to be absorbed into the structure of the verse; it should not be hit hard. It has *all* been *said*, but we are still involved in the same mistakes—this is the implication which follows. In line two it would be a distortion of the meter to stress *can* rather than *say* and it would not help the meaning. To stress both words would be to add a stress too many for the trimetric line. There is only one way to stress in terms of both meter and meaning. Lines eight to ten need no primary stress—they enlarge the main idea but do not add a major separate idea. Line eleven sums up, as the hurrying anapaests lead to the conclusion—metrically and meaningfully focusing the major theme of the stanza.

Stanza four presents a special problem for the interpreter. Literary analysis elucidates the irony of the *blind* skyscrapers proclaiming the strength of *collective* man, while the languages pour their vain *competitive* excuses into the neutral air. In the writing, however, there is a main clause split in half by a subordinate clause, which needs a parenthetical treatment having sufficient stress of the cogent words to point up the ironical comment.

IV. 1 Into this *neutral* air
2 Where *blind* skyscrapers use
3 Their full height to proclaim
4 The strength of *Collective* Man,
5 Each language pours its vain
6 *Competitive* excuse:
7 But *who* can live for long
8 In an euphoric dream;
9 Out of the *mirror* they *stare*,
10 *Imperialism's face*
11 And the *international wrong*.

No other word but *who* should receive primary stress in lines seven and eight, and a focus of responsibility is achieved in the heavy stressing of the last three lines.

The remainder of the poem runs thus.

V. 1 Faces along the bar
2 *Cling* to their *average* day:
3 The lights must never go out,
4 The music must always play.
5 All the conventions conspire
6 To make this fort *assume*
7 The *furniture* of *home;*
8 *Lest* we should *see* where we *are*,
9 *Lost* in a haunted wood
10 *Children afraid* of the *night*
11 Who have *never* been *happy* or *good*.

VI. 1 The windiest militant trash
2 Important Persons shout
3 Is *not* so *crude* as our *wish:*
4 What *mad* Nijinsky wrote
5 About Diaghilev
6 Is *true* of the *normal* heart;
7 For the *error* bred in the bone
8 Of each woman and each man

9 *Craves* what it *cannot* have,
10 Not *universal love*
11 But to be loved *alone*.

VII. 1 From the conservative dark
2 Into the ethical life
3 The dense commuters come,
4 Repeating their morning vow;
5 "I *will* be true to the wife.[18]
6 I'll concentrate more on my work,"
7 And *helpless* governors wake
8 To resume their *compulsory* game:
9 *Who* can *release* them *now*,
10 Who can *reach* the *deaf*,
11 Who can *speak* for the *dumb*?

VIII. 1 All I have is a *voice*
2 To *undo* the *folded lie*,
3 The *romantic* lie in the brain
4 Of the *sensual* man-in-the-street
5 And the lie of *Authority*
6 Whose buildings *grope* the sky:
7 There is *no* such thing as the *State*
8 And *no* one exists *alone;*
9 *Hunger* allows no *choice*
10 To the *citizen* or the *police;*
11 We must *love* one another or *die*.

IX. 1 *Defenceless* under the *night*
2 Our world in *stupour* lies;
3 Yet, dotted everywhere,
4 *Ironic points* of *light*
5 *Flash* out wherever the *Just*
6 *Exchange* their *messages:*
7 May *I*, composed like them
8 Of Eros and of dust,
9 Beleaguered by the same
10 Negation and despair,
11 Show an *affirming flame*.

After the main idea has been stated in the second line of stanza five, the verse goes into a rapid passage which makes no use of primary stress, but as it rushes on, it echoes the desperate clinging to a specious security and comes to a climax with the revelation that this is the false assumption of home. The verse slows down to consider the truth of the matter.

In stanza six, the extra-literary and historical interests in lines one, two, three, and four do not receive primary stress. They are not the main object of the verse. As the literary analysis showed, the poet ranges, but he ranges connectedly; and so must the oral interpreter retain a mental connectedness in rendering the parts within the whole architectonic of the verse. The real error—the offence that has driven the culture mad (stanza two)—is brought to light in stanza six as the possessive love which is not confined to the mad heart but is true of the normal heart also.

The mechanical sameness of the first six lines of stanza seven echoes the mechanical repetition of the commuters returning to life in the manner of automatons. Theirs is a monotony broken only by the futility of a morning resolution, which actually serves to stress by its own unavailing repetition their lack of power to carry through a purposeful decision. The description of the helpless governors waking to resume their compulsory game gives explicit emphasis to what has so far been implied. The primary stress for the last three lines slows down the verse for the pondered questions which the poet asks.

Stanza eight ties the previous themes together and gives the poet's answer to the "folded lie" of the private man and public authority. The word *grope* links with *blind* skyscrapers of stanza four, and should do so in the interpreter's mind and rendering. In line nine of stanza eight any emphasis but *choice* in the phrase "no choice" would distort the meter. If "no" were stressed, it would also introduce a phonetically redundant emphasis, as "no" has already

[18] Auden's own italics.

received primary stress in the previous lines.

The contemplative final stanza offers a contrast to the uncertainty and fear which were an obsession at the beginning. Only three words have primary stress in the last five lines, emphasizing the poet's sense of resolution as he rises above the conflict but yet remains identified with human kind.

IV

The present paper is not an exhaustive study but simply aims to indicate ways in which a close scrutiny of a specific text may be made in terms of relevant literary theory and may be combined with a close study of emphasis for the purpose of oral rendering. Such work on the part of a student of literature would not mean an aping of the critics, or an abstract discussion of theoretical values, or a mechanical application of rules, but would provide one avenue for developing a more critical and appreciative grasp of the literary work as well as a more sensitive ear for the linguistic and structural values in the oral rendering of it.

TWO KINDS OF INTERPRETATION

The impression seems to be getting stronger and stronger, in these days of excessive teaching and excessive learning, that no one can do anything or learn anything without being taught,—without "taking a regular course," as the phrase is. This seems to be especially true in the matter of vocal cultivation. People go to schools of oratory with nothing within themselves which is clamorous for expression; not even a very "still small voice" urging them to express something. Many who desire, or think they do, to be readers, as there are many who desire, or think they do, to be artists, evidently believe that if they be trained in technique they can be readers or artists.

But suppose some one is impelled to cultivate vocal power because of his desire to express what he has sympathetically and lovingly assimilated, of a work of genius: if he endeavor to give an honest expression, so far as in him lies, to what he feels, and avoid trying to express what he does not feel, and if he persevere in his endeavor, with always a coefficient ideal back of his reading, he may—in time, he certainly will—become a better reader than another could if he should set out, with malice prepense, to be an elocutionist, and with that malicious purpose, were to employ a mere voice-trainer who should teach him to perpetrate all sorts of vocal extravagances, to make faces, and to gesticulate when reading what does not need any gesture. Such an one, after passing out of the hands of his trainer, is most likely to go forth and afflict the public with his performances, which will be wholly a pitiable exhibition of himself.

Some of the best readers I have ever known have been of the former class, who honestly voiced what they had sympathetically assimilated, and did not strain after effect. But it seems that when one sets out to read, with no interior capital, he or she, especially she, is apt to run into all kinds of extravagances which disgust people of culture and taste. The voice, instead of being the organ of the soul, is the betrayer of soullessness.

Without that interior life which can respond to the indefinite life of a work of genius (indefinite, that is, to the intellect), a trained voice can do nothing of itself in the way of real interpretation. It may bring out the definite articulating thought, in a way, but the electric aura in which the thought should be enveloped, will be wanting. . . .

Hiram Corson, *The Voice and Spiritual Education* (New York, 1923), pp. 116-120.

AIR FORCE LANGUAGE IN THE MAKING

James L. Jackson

THE United States Air Force is a tightly integrated national organization of nearly a million members performing much of its necessary communication through the spoken word. It uses speech as a major method of passing information and giving orders; and it uses conference extensively to develop main lines of agreement and action before they are put on paper. The tendency to rely heavily on speech has resulted in the development of considerable knowledge and skill in the use of language in the Air Force.

Let us examine more closely two special characteristics of the Air Force speech situation. One is that new weapons and new concepts of weapon and aircraft employment are constantly introduced into the Air Force, so that there is a steady need for new words and meanings. The other special characteristic is the occasional command direction in language matters within the Air Force. That is to say, the top levels of the Air Force command structure sometimes guide and order the direction of language change in the Air Force. An example is the directive to use "airman" in place of "enlisted man," a change that has been established in the Air Force for three years.[1]

We see that the Air Force presents a somewhat different speech situation from that of industrial management or the college campus, though all these enterprises use speech heavily in their operations. However, the two pressures mentioned above operate with special clarity in the Air Force: it needs to develop new terms and meanings rapidly and constantly, and the top command of the Air Force can and occasionally does exercise considerable control of language. Let us first look at some examples of new terms and meanings developing because of our evolving technology.

AN ABORT (*n.*); TO ABORT (*v.tr.* and *intr.*) 1. Both the verb and the noun were used during World War II by the American Air Corps to refer to the failure of an aircraft to make a combat mission, usually because of mechanical failure after being airborne. A rate of 2% to 5% of aborts was not unusual for bomber strikes, and the commander of a bomber wing had to anticipate and control his loss rate from this source, just as he did his losses from flak and enemy fighters and from AOCP (aircraft out of commission for parts). Since the morale of an aircraft commander and his crew often entered into the decision whether to abort after leaving the area of the field, a wing commander's abort rate was often taken as one index to his unit's morale.

2. In the last few years the verb "to abort" has been used in a somewhat different way, partly because the USAF

Major James L. Jackson, USAF (Ph.D., University of Illinois, 1949) is an associate professor in the Department of English, United States Air Force Academy, Denver, Colorado.

[1] All three armed services tend to direct language change, and all three recognize that there is some overlap in the special language they use. An indication of this overlap is the *Dictionary of United States Military Terms* (Washington, D. C., 1954), which the Army, Navy, and Air Force publish as separate pamphlets; and a similar indication is *Joint Army Navy Air Force Publication 169* (Washington, D. C., 1953), known in the services as *JANAP 169*, which lists the authorized abbreviations used by all three services.

has not been engaged in big bomber strikes for ten years. The word is now used to refer to a pilot's decision during or just after taking off in any kind of aircraft not to continue with the take-off. With some aircraft types such as the T-29 (Convair), if a certain speed is not reached on the ground, the pilot must abort the take-off. Large transport aircraft such as the T-29 have reversible props which can stop the plane quickly and safely. A jet fighter pilot does not have props, however, and he may once in a while get two-thirds of the way down the runway and find that he is not getting flying speed and must abort. He may pull up his wheels and slide to a stop on the runway or on the apron beyond it. Some fighter types like the F-94 are equipped with drag landing chutes which can be used in an abort.

AIR (*adj.*) The conventional meaning for this adjective is "by air," and the title "44th Air Rescue Squadron" refers to the ability of that organization to search and to effect rescue from the air. But the word "air" is now also widely used in names and titles as an adjective to mean airpower or to refer to Air Force mission and responsibility. Some examples of this broader meaning are the use of "air" in the titles Air University, Air Police, Air Command and Staff College, Air Defense Command, and Strategic Air Command. Similarly, the title "Air Training Officers" has just been given to the young officers who will simulate an upper class during the first two years of the Air Force Academy.

But while the word "air" is often used in service titles in the general sense of "Air Force mission," it has not been authorized for this use within the Air Force in the title of the new Academy. The Air Force's West Point is officially the United States Air Force Academy, and the authorized abbreviations are "Air Force Academy" and "USAF," but not "Air Academy." The fuller forms are being used in the Air Force, but the shorter form "Air Academy" has begun to occur widely and constantly in civilian newspapers and magazines, appearing in such well-informed publications as *Time, Collier's,* and the unofficial *Air Force Times.*[2] This strong, growing tendency to use "Air" instead of "Air Force" in the title "Air Academy" is a striking instance of the broad new meaning now attaching to the adjective "air."

CRUISE CONTROL (*n.*) This term refers to the practice of flying at the speed, altitude, and trim to get the greatest possible range from a specific gas load. The practice applies especially to cargo aircraft, where range and economy are often more important than a slight advantage in speed. The instructions for operating many cargo aircraft list the "cruise control factors," which include the trim of cowlings and elevator and trim tabs, and the careful setting of speed, altitude, and gas mixture for the most economical operation. For example, the SA-16 Grumman "Albatross," the twin-engine triphibian used in most USAF air rescue squadrons, has a top speed of 247 m.p.h. for a few hours but will also fly for 22 hours and go 2700 miles at its slower cruise speed.

FLARE-OUT (*n.*); TO FLARE (*v.intr.*) This is the term now used to describe the pilot's action in landing when he changes his plane from a nose-down, gliding position to a nose-up position over the runway and throttles back, preparing to settle in for his

[2] See *Time* (May 23, 1955), 23, 24; see *Collier's* (July 23, 1955), 34-38; see also *Air Force Times* (May 21, 1955), 1.

touch-down. During World War II and after, this final action of the landing process was called "rounding-out," but that term has now been replaced by "flaring out." Choosing the right instant to begin his flare-out is one of the many times when the pilot must demonstrate precision and skill; if he flares out too high, the plane will drop in for a rough landing. The technical orders on operating the B-25, which are continuously revised, now use "flare" and "flare-out" regularly in describing several landing procedures.

OVER THE FENCE (*adj.*); OVER THE FENCE SPEED (*n.*) These are also terms used in describing landing procedure. They refer to the speed the pilot maintains as he glides in toward the runway on the last part of the approach leg of his landing pattern. This is about 130 m.p.h. in the B-25, and is a speed which, combined with the proper angle of glide, guarantees the pilot that he will reach the field even if an engine should begin to malfunction. Naturally the "fence" referred to is the boundary of the field, and as the pilot nears the runway at his over the fence speed, he flares out and throttles back for as smooth a landing as possible. This landing procedure is described in the following sentence from the recent autobiography of test pilot William Bridgeman, when he reports that a rocket-and-jet powered research plane, the Skyrocket, "comes over the fence at close to 200 miles an hour and she touches down at 160."[3] Interestingly, Bridgeman was testing then at the vast dry lake bed at Muroc, California, where there is a long runway but no fences. His construction obviously means that the Skyrocket glides in, with some power on, at a hot 200 m.p.h.

[3] William Bridgeman and Jacquiline Hazard, *The Lonely Sky* (New York, 1955), p. 137.

PCS (*n.,adj.,adv.*) This is an official abbreviation, originally colloquial but now standard in Air Force speech and writing, meaning Permanent Change of Station. A PCS trip is one of the two main kinds of trips an Air Force officer or airman makes; he may go long or short distances but the important thing is whether or not the trip is considered a permanent move for himself and his family. Often a PCS move is the shift from one Air Force base to another that the average officer makes every three to four years.

TDY (*n.,adj.,adv.*) This official abbreviation, the antonym of PCS, refers to Temporary DutY away from one's permanent Air Force station. The USAF officer and airman often perform duty, such as attending a technical school, involving absence from their home station for periods up to six months, which is now the legal limit for TDY. Another TDY situation occurs when squadrons of the Strategic Air Command fly from the ZI (Zone of the Interior, that is, the continental United States) to bases overseas for a two to three months TDY. Attendance at the fourteen-week Squadron Officer School at Maxwell AF Base, Ala., is always TDY, but attendance at the ten-month Air Command and Staff School at Maxwell is always PCS. The expressions "TDY" and "PCS" are used regularly in the USAF Inspector General's periodical *TIG Brief*, and both are authorized in *JANAP 169*, the official list of abbreviations for all three services.

TURN-AROUND TIME (*n.*) This means the minimum time needed to unload, reload, refuel, and otherwise prepare a specific kind of aircraft for a second flight after it has completed a first one. It is the minimum elapsed time between landing and taking off again fully gassed and reloaded or re-

armed. This time is apt to be under thirty minutes for some types of fighter planes operating in combat or as high as four hours for large transport types. The turn-around time is a necessary item in planning the world-circling routes flown by MATS (the Military Air Transport Service), or in planning how many strikes a certain kind of fighter-bomber can make in a day.

STAFF STUDY (*n.*) 1. During the period 1930-1945, this was the main term used by air staffs to mean a complete projected air battle plan, which if approved was then reduced into combat orders for various units.

2. After 1945, the term changed its meaning considerably in the Air Force. Several other terms came into use for the many types of combat planning, such as "staff estimate," "commander's estimate," "operations plan," and "estimate of the situation"; and the term "staff study" came to be reserved for proposing solutions to administrative, noncombat problems only. Although different commands of the Air Force now prescribe longer or shorter forms of the staff study for their members, a full or expanded form is widely known and is taught at the Air Command and Staff College at Maxwell AFB. The five parts of the full form are a statement of the problem to be solved, factors bearing on the problem (facts, criteria, assumptions), discussion, conclusions, and action recommended. Sometimes appendices of additional information, called "tabs," are attached. The manual, *Guide for Air Force Writing*, has a chapter on the staff study and notes: "The staff study report is a problem-solution type of report. It is used when you want to report the solution of a problem; it is not a form for solving a problem."[4]

[4] *Guide for Air Force Writing*, AF Manual 11-3 (Washington, D. C., 1953), p. 82.

We have now looked at several terms which have developed in Air Force speech under the natural pressure of technological growth. Terms of this kind are regarded as standard within the service, are widely used, and are clearly distinguished from slang. Some of them have been in use for many years; and as the rapidly developing science of supersonic flight continues to add new planes to the Air Force inventory, new terms will be needed to describe the details of their performance and use.

Let us now look at the operation of a second pressure—command direction. Now and then the top levels of the Air Force command structure take a hand in linguistic change, usually when a confusion has developed within the service in the natural growth of Air Force language, or when a particular term is found to be misleading both to service people and to the public. In these occasional cases, the Air Staff issues direction from the Pentagon on what term will be used, and the change is made in the Air Force quickly, smoothly, and permanently.

AIRMAN (*n.*) As noted earlier, this term has been used within the Air Force since late 1952 in place of the term "enlisted man." The "airman" can be either a male or female enlisted person, and the term has completely replaced the older terms "enlisted man" and "EM" in Air Force usage. The change was directed partly to enhance the prestige of Air Force enlisted personnel and also to make an additional distinction beween the Air Force, established as a separate service in 1947, and the older sister services. Unfortunately the word "airman" is now no longer usable to refer to a flyer or aircrew member. Its proper use can be seen in a recent *USAF Academy Regulation:* "Tempor-

ary duty orders for officers and airmen will be requested on AF Form 626 if three or more officers or airmen are to perform temporary duty at the same place and for the same purpose."[5]

GUIDED MISSILE (*n.*) The term "guided missile" was directed by Headquarters USAF late in 1954 for use in place of "pilotless aircraft."[6] Obviously the change indicates a clarification of attitude toward unmanned air vehicles, which are intended originally for flight as missiles and are not aircraft which were modified to fly without pilots. The change to "guided missiles" has been smooth and complete, and the term "pilotless aircraft" has disappeared from the *Dictionary of United States Military Terms.*[7]

IRAN (*n.,adj.*) Pronounced *ai-ran,* this word as used in the Air Force usually has nothing to do with the country of the same name. The IRAN concept was a new plan for depot maintenance of aircraft, and the word was made by taking letters from the phrase "Inspect and Repair As Necessary." Until 1953, all the various types of aircraft were sent into depots at set intervals of several months for complete inspection and the automatic replacement of many parts. The IRAN system provided that the aircraft sent into depots at these intervals would be inspected thoroughly and that then only the engine and plane parts actually seriously worn would be replaced. This economy measure has worked out very well. The maintenance concept of IRAN has since been expanded to include modification of aircraft also, such as the installation of new types of instruments and radio navigation aids.

OBSERVER (*n.*) There are now only two aircrew ratings in the U. S. Air Force—pilot and observer. The terms "navigator" and "bombardier" are now no longer used officially, and the various aircrew skills are all concentrated in the observer. The term "observer" was probably obtained by shortening "radar observer," since the observer in such planes as the B-47 performs with the aid of radar all the duties formerly requiring a navigator, bombardier, and radar observer.

The terms discussed above are some examples of the vigorously growing and changing language of the United States Air Force. These are all standard terms and are not felt to be slang, though very few have yet found their way into commercial dictionaries. We can probably expect to see in the future many signs of the two pressures touched on here. The pressure from technical developments is already anticipated in such comments as this in an article by a pilot in *Flying Safety:*

> High performance [that is, sonic and supersonic] aircraft commonly exhibit some undesirable characteristics. A whole new language describes the deficiencies found in this new flight regime: 1 G buffet, rudder shift or yaw, wing drop, aileron buzz, tucking, and pitchup.[8]

Perhaps the less expected pressure on Air Force language is that of command control. Most of us have come to believe that language change cannot be directed, but there have been many cases of direction within the Air Force community. When the top levels of the Air Force decide that a new term is needed to forestall confusion or to clarify a new procedure for the Air Force and perhaps the public, then the Air Staff orders the linguistic change within the service. Quite probably the uniform use of such terms as "airman" and "guided missile" within the Air Force will influence public usage.

[5] See *USAF Academy Regulation 30-3* (December 29, 1954).

[6] Cf. *Air Force Times* (January 15, 1955), 1.

[7] (Washington, D. C., 1954).

[8] (January, 1955), 3.

THE ENTHYMEME: IDIOM OF PERSUASION

Earl W. Wiley

YOU perhaps have heard of the man who talked himself to death in three words. He shouted, "Down with Stalin!" This is an enthymeme, a rhetorical syllogism. It is the focal point of this paper, as it is the focal point of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. It signalizes the kind of logic we live by in the give-and-take of controversy, when persuasion is the end sought, and where fact must share place not only with probabilities and signs, but with the behavior patterns of speaker and listener. Patently, this is not the traditional syllogism of laboratory logic employed by scholars in tracking down abstract truth, and concerned with demonstration. If it were, the speaker might argue tightly:

> Tyrants should be deposed.
> Stalin is a tyrant.
> Stalin should be deposed.

Such precision in reasoning we leave to the needs of demonstration. An enthymeme, on the other hand, is one man's judgment of the propriety of events in some conflict involving people; being contingent, it is not demonstration, and being controversial, it is framed in argument. Patterns of the frame are various, and these are designated by Aristotle as topics. The design of this paper is to isolate the enthymeme in its topical habitat, and to observe it as an agent of persuasion.

For this purpose we turn to Aristotle's catalogue of twenty-eight universal topics or lines of reasoning suitable to any and all controversial situations.[1] First among these is listed the topic of opposites. Says Aristotle, "Self-control (A) is beneficial (B); for licentiousness is harmful." And, "If war is the cause of our present evils, it is peace that we need to correct them."[2] In sum, if the opposite of A is true of the opposite of B, you establish the probability that A is true of B.

At a Republican rally in Atlanta, Georgia, early last fall, Nelson Rockefeller, then undersecretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, declared, "We elected a Democratic governor in Maine. I don't see why you can't elect a Republican congressman in Georgia."[3] This enthymeme, rhetorically sound, is premised on the opposites that what the Democrats could do in Republican Maine, the Republicans could do in Democratic Georgia. Euripides put it this way:

> But if falsehood is persuasive in this world,
> Be sure now that the opposite holds good:
> In the world there's many a true word ne'er believed.[4]

Declared Abraham Lincoln, "If Slavery is right, all words, acts, laws, and Constitutions against it, are themselves wrong . . . if it is wrong, they [the Democrats] cannot justly insist upon its extension—its enlargement."[5] Again,

Earl W. Wiley is Professor of Speech at The Ohio State University. He presented this paper at a sectional meeting of the Convention of the Speech Association of America at Chicago in 1954.

[1] *The Rhetoric of Aristotle*, trans. Lane Cooper (New York and London, 1932), pp. 159-171. For a detailed study of the enthymeme, see James H. McBurney, "The Place of the Enthymeme in Rhetorical Theory," *SM*, III (September 1936), 49-74.

[2] Cooper, *op. cit.*, p. 159.

[3] Reported in the daily press.

[4] Cooper, *op. cit.*, p. 159. The quotation is from Euripides' *Thyestes*.

[5] *The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln*, ed. Roy P. Basler (New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1953), IV, 29.

". . . if slavery is right—ordained by the Almighty—on *one side* of a line . . . then it is positively wrong to harrass [sic], and bedevil the owners of it . . . on the other side of the line."[6]

Let us turn to topic four of the catalogue in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. This is framed on the degree of more and less, and supplies one of the richest mines of enthymemes for the rhetorician. If ". . . Theseus did no wrong [in abducting Helen], neither did Paris"; . . . and "if Hector did well to slay Petroclus, so did Paris in slaying Archilles."[7] It is this topic that nags at you when determining the relative ratings of your students, evaluating candidates on election day, or selecting the members of an all-American football team. Discrimination is its slide rule. Brutus had a hard choice to make, according to Shakespeare. Was it Rome or Caesar? Here was his answer —and enthymeme—"not that I loved Caesar less, but that I loved Rome more." Chaucer used the identical mechanism in these words:

> That if gold ruste, what shal iren do?
> For if a preest be foul, on whom we truste,
> No wonder is a lewed man to ruste.[8]

Definition is another source of enthymemes (number seven in Aristotle's catalogue). Not so fertile a region as that of degree or of opposites, it is productive of objective proof when rooted in the context of the discussion. That built-in feature is fundamental, since the persuasive process is essentially something dynamic, something evolving, and rhetorical behavior is always concrete and contingent. "What is 'the devine'?" asked Socrates. "It must be either a god or the work of a god." "Well, then," he concluded, with the effect of demonstration, "any one who believes in the existence of a work of a god must needs believe in the existence of gods."[9]

Logical division is yet another cradle for enthymemes, especially those of the refutative kind. This is Aristotle's ninth topic. "All men do wrong from one of three motives, A, B, C." "In my case," Aristotle continued, pinning down his enthymeme, "the first two of these motives are out of the question; and as for the third, C, the prosecution itself does not allege this."[10]

Theodore Parker applied this formula in the passage: "In the universe, all is done according to law, by the regular and orderly actions of the forces thereof. . . ." Completing his enthymeme he added, with objective finality, "Nothing is done by human magic, nothing by divine miracle."[11]

Declared Abraham Lincoln, "Now I protest against that counterfeit logic which concludes that, because I do not want a black woman for a *slave* I must necessarily want her for a *wife*." Building on this premise he concluded, "I need not have her for either. . . ."[12] Although dichotomy of this kind is not uncommon in rhetoric, logical division usually calls for multiple classifications, the number of these being determined by the special knowledge of the speaker.

Enthymemes may also be constructed by a process of induction. This, Aristotle's tenth topic, may be treated with considerable objectivity. "If we do not entrust our horses to men who have mishandled other people's horses, nor our ships to those who have capsized the ships of others, and if this is our way with everything else," he explained, "then beware of employing for the safety

[6] *Ibid.*, III, 430.
[7] Cooper, *op. cit.*, p. 161.
[8] *The College Chaucer*, ed. Henry Noble MacCracken (New Haven, 1913), p. 15.
[9] Cooper, *op. cit.*, p. 163.
[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 163-164.
[11] Rufus Leighton, *Lessons from the World of Matter and the World of Man* (Chicago, 1886), p. 19.
[12] Basler, *op. cit.*, II, 405.

of our State men [mercenaries] who have ill protected the safety of others."[13] Shakespeare made use of the same device in the following, but gave it a pathetic pitch:

> He hath brought many captives home to Rome,
> Whose ransoms did the general coffers fill:
> Did this in Caesar seem ambitious?
> When that the poor have cried, Caesar hath wept:
> Ambition should be made of sterner stuff . . .
> You all did see that on the Lupercal
> I thrice presented him a kingly crown,
> Which he did thrice refuse: was this ambition?

Little by little, with each new reference, the mind of the listener is conditioned to receive the conclusion. Each citation contributes its own response, and this may be ethical, pathetic, or logical, depending on its origin in speaker, listener, or subject. Note how the progression unfolds in the following: ". . . we owe our children the most demanding, challenging curriculum that is within their capabilities. Michelangelo did not learn to paint by spending his time doodling. Mozart was not an accomplished pianist at the age of eight as a result of spending his days in front of a television set. Like Eve Curie, like Helen Keller, they responded to the challenge of their lives by a disciplined training; and they gained a new freedom."[14]

This pyramiding of responses may go on to sophistic length, when the virtuosity of the speaker tends to dominate the rational force of the argument. In such a case the appeal becomes highly ethical. In a strictly objective approach, the sequence may well end with the completion of the mission. Shelley called up but a single reference in his apostrophe: "O Wind, if Winter comes, can Spring be far behind?"

An enthymeme may also be anchored to some existing decision. This is topic eleven in Aristotle's list, and is explained by him in Sappho's words: "Death is an evil: the gods have so judged it, or they would die."[15] Again, when Plato was thought to have spoken somewhat dogmatically, Aristippus replied, "Well, our friend," meaning Socrates, "never talked that way."[16] And, argued Isocrates, "Paris [was] a worthy man, since the [three] goddesses preferred him to all others. . . ."[17]

Existing decision combines personal opinion with distinguished authority, as if the subjectivity of the one is strengthened by the objectivity of the other. This transfer device is popular in American oratory, as suggested by the multitude of orators who, in defense of isolation, have quoted George Washington against "entangling alliances." Sometimes the existing decision lies in the impersonal shadows of the past. "There are some who for varying reasons would appease Red China," declared Douglas MacArthur. "They are blind to history's clear lesson, for history teaches with unmistakable emphasis that appeasement but begets new and bloodier wars."[18]

Sometimes an existing decision is ethical in nature, as in Lincoln's maxim, "A house divided against itself, cannot stand."[19] But this may be given a malevolent twist. "I would like to know if it is his [Douglas's] opinion that a house divided against itself *can stand*," inquired Lincoln. "If he does," he quipped, much to the delight of his partisan listeners, thereby evoking a pathetic response, "then there is a

[13] Cooper, *op. cit.*, p. 164.
[14] Seymour St. John, "The Freedom to be One's Best," *Reader's Digest* (January 1954), 124.
[15] Cooper, *op. cit.*, p. 165.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 165.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 165.
[18] "Address to the Congress," *The Age of Danger*, ed. Harold F. Harding (New York, 1952), p. 153.
[19] Basler, *op. cit.*, II, 461.

question of veracity, not between him and me, but between the Judge and an authority of a somewhat higher character."[20]

The response of people to enthymemes, then, may be either subjective or objective, or a blending of the two. A notion seems to prevail, however, that persuasion is at its best only when it is manifestly objective. A debater's brief is representative of that opinion. Actually, only the subject matter of a speech can be objective, and then only in a degree this side of demonstration—that is, necessity, as conclusions premised on probabilities must themselves be probabilities. Since the controversial situation always involves the attitudes of speaker and listener, for the speaker to ignore all but the subject matter is for him to back away from the rhetorical syllogism toward a demonstrative species of logic, indicating that our speakers and listeners can neither laugh nor cry.

If each part of your automobile responds favorably to the tests of your mechanic, the car itself responds. Out of this relationship of *whole to parts*, and *parts to whole*, of genus to species, enthymemes may also emerge. This is the twelfth in Aristotle's list. "What temple has he profaned?" asked Aristotle. "To which of the gods recognized by the State has he failed to pay honor?"[21]

Herein is the logic of the widow's mite, and of Benjamin Franklin's pun, "If we don't hang together, we'll hang SEPARATELY." It is basic to Kipling's thought that, "the strength of the Pack is the Wolf, and the strength of the Wolf is the Pack."[22] Declared President Eisenhower, "We know these matters to be the common concern of all our nations and peoples—for whatever touches one of us touches all."[23] The form was favorite with Franklin D. Roosevelt. "From the gift that each has given, all have gained,"[24] he protested. Again, "Danger to one is danger to all."[25] Further, ". . . our well-being depends, in the long run, upon the well-being of our neighbors."[26] And, "When peace has been broken anywhere, the peace of all countries everywhere is in danger."[27]

Number thirteen among Aristotle's topics is described as the topic from consequences. This elementary form stems from the paradox that both good and bad effects sometimes arise from the same action. "For example," Aristotle explains, "education results in unpopularity, a bad consequence, and in wisdom, a good consequence. And so you may argue: It is not well to be educated, since it is not well to be unpopular. Or: It is well to be educated, since it is well to be wise."[28] Callippus recognized this topic and included it in his *Art of Rhetoric*, one of the treatises Aristotle consulted in writing his *Rhetoric*.

The donnybrook over Senator Joe McCarthy is in point. One might argue that the condemnation of Senator McCarthy by the United States Senate would redound to the prestige of the Senate—a good consequence—or to his martyrdom—a bad consequence. The action, however, was not a question of absolute right and wrong; involved were the rights of free speech and of full investigation in relation to the rights of personal privacy; and the wrongs of Senator McCarthy may be countered by

[20] *Ibid.*, III, 17.
[21] Cooper, *op. cit.*, p. 166.
[22] *The Works of Rudyard Kipling* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899), VII, 103.
[23] "A Lesson for the World," *Vital Speeches of the Day* (November 15, 1953), 67.
[24] *Nothing to Fear*, ed. B. D. Zevin (Cambridge, Mass.: The Riverside Press, 1946), p. 58.
[25] *Ibid.*, p. 5.
[26] *Ibid.*, p. 59.
[27] *Ibid.*, p. 181.
[28] Cooper, *op. cit.*, p. 166.

the wrongs of Communism. This is only to repeat that a rhetorical situation is a contingent situation.

The trained rhetoricians of the Bible availed themselves of this topic, further confirming the high importance that Callippus and Aristotle both placed on alternate choices as an elementary form of argument;

> And Jesus answered and said unto them, I also will ask you one thing, which if ye tell me, I in like wise will tell you by what authority I do these things: The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven, or of men? And they reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say, From heaven; he will say unto us, Why did ye not then believe him? But if we shall say, Of men; we fear the people; for all hold John as a prophet.[29]

Aristotle fashioned his fourteenth topic on the same frame as that of the thirteenth, but in the protracted approach he contrasted only *opposites*. "For instance," he explained, "the priestess urged her son not to engage in public speaking: 'For,' said she, 'if you speak honestly, men will hate you; if you speak dishonestly, the gods will hate you.'" But this may be treated in contrary alternatives: "Now you *ought* to engage in public speaking; for if you speak honestly, the gods will love you; if you speak dishonestly, men will love you."[30]

In a law suit contested in a Greek court between Corax, the rhetorician, and Tisias, his pupil, Corax is reported as saying: "You must pay me if you win the case, because that proves the worth of my lessons. You must pay me also, if you lose the case, for the court will issue a decree against you." Replied Tisias, "I will pay you nothing, because if I lose the case, your instruction has been worthless; whereas if I win, the court will absolve me from the claim." The court was unable to decide on the case; hence the quip that Tisias was a bad egg because laid by a bad crow (korax).

The most effective topic of paradox, however, according to Aristotle, rests not on the chance of consequences. It rests on the penchant of speakers to say the noble thing publicly and to do the expedient thing privately. This variant of double talk is topic fifteen among the universals, and is described by Aristotle as *inward thoughts and outward show*.[31]

Charles H. Woolbert in the early years of our Speech Association called our attention to the substance of this topic. He remarked, "We assume to believe one thing and then proceed to do its opposite, what has been called 'irrational conduct'; because the hidden, unspoken, and often unconfessed inference is stronger than the verbal one."[32]

Jesus of Nazareth called this form of conduct plain hypocrisy. "This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth," chided Jesus, "and honoureth me with *their* lips; but their heart is far from me."[33] Again, this time addressing the scribes and the Pharisees, he cautioned, "All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, *that* observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not."[34]

The breach between the Golden Rule and the idols of the cave and marketplace suggests the baffling human equations that Aristotle would have us bring to the attention of our students in plotting the territory belonging to the speaker. And what does the speaker do in this dilemma? Aware that methodology is the speaker's main stock in trade, Aristotle gave the following advice: "From the premises of your opponent

[29] Matt. 21.24-26.
[30] Cooper, *op. cit.*, p. 166.
[31] *Ibid.*, p. 167.
[32] "The Place of Logic in a System of Persuasion," *QJS*, IV (1918), 38.
[33] Matt. 15.8.
[34] *Ibid.*, 23.3.

you must try to draw the inference which he does not."[35] That is, says Lane Cooper, "If he [your opponent] assumes a moral tone, you appeal to the inward self-interest of the audience; if he assumes that men act from self-interest alone, you appeal to the motives of justice and nobility which they openly profess."[36] That is the speaker's way of keeping his opponent honest.

With uncanny fidelity Abraham Lincoln applied this technique to a position taken by his friend, Joshua Speed. "You say if Kansas fairly votes herself a free state, as a Christian you will rather rejoice at it," he reminded Speed. "All decent slave-holders *talk* that way; and I do not doubt their candor. But they never *vote* that way. Although in a private letter, or conversation, you will express your preference that Kansas shall be free, you would vote for no man for Congress who would say the same thing publicly."[37]

With these samplings we conclude our survey. It confirms Aristotle's judgment that the enthymeme is the singular tool of rhetorica-logic, used by speakers from Socrates to President Eisenhower as the hard core of their proof. It suggests to us a mechanism of argument flexible enough to meet the exigencies of persuasion: the contingencies of the moment, the probabilities generic to controversy, and the complexities of the speaker-listener-thesis situation.

At this point comes our professional paradox. Although the enthymeme stands out as the logical idiom of persuasion, it occupies a lowly place in the body of our rhetorical theory and speech criticism. This is not to say it is entirely obscured. It is to say it lacks anything like the prestige accorded it by Aristotle as a medium of persuasion. There are historical influences behind this change of emphasis. Yet one suspects among us the existence of a sentiment that the enthymeme is something tricky and barbaric, despite the credibility of Aristotle and the example of good men who used it to defeat falsehood and to propagate truth. Perhaps the time has come for us to reappraise the subject, for to deal with persuasion as an instrumental art and to ignore the enthymeme is to play *Dragnet* without Sergeant Joe Friday.

[35] Cooper, *op. cit.*, p. 167.
[36] *Ibid.*, p. 167.
[37] Basler, *op. cit.*, II, 322.

ARISTOTLE'S *RHETORIC*

> The study of Rhetoric as an educational instrument . . . has at least in England been practically neglected since the beginning of the eighteenth century. . . . It is possible that the time will again come when the world will recognize that "it is not enough to know what to say, but it is necessary also to know how to say it." . . . Then the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle will, I think, be widely read, as being perhaps a solitary instance of a book which not only begins a science but completes it.
>
> J. E. C. Welldon as quoted in Lane Cooper, *The Rhetoric of Aristotle* (New York, 1932), p. xii.

THE ACADEMIC AND THE RHETORICAL MODES OF THOUGHT

Elbert W. Harrington

W. Rhys Roberts once said that, when modern students are asked to cling to the academic spirit and shun the rhetorical, "they are listening, perhaps unconsciously, to the ever-living voice of Plato."[1]

This statement is arresting, not because it involves Plato, for Plato's seeming antipathy to rhetoric is well known, but because it implies that, to many, there is a sharp distinction between the academic and rhetorical modes of thought—so sharp, in fact, that the two cannot exist comfortably together.

This sharp distinction is suggested by other authors. One has held that Aristotle, who probably influenced the subject most, constructed a rhetoric which did not subordinate the "rules of argument and the end of persuasion to the requirements of accuracy and truth."[2] Another has stated of rhetoric: "We are prepared to accept other arguments than those with which traditional logic, deductive or inductive, concerns itself. We shall consider as proof . . . any argument that diminishes our doubt, that quells our hesitations." And in the preface of the work in which this thought is expressed, still another writer has said, "Rhetoric seeks to justify a thesis by relying upon a general knowledge of men, of their characters, of their passions; it is an art of obtaining assent."[3]

The argument of these writers suggests, at least, that while the academic mode of thought deals with the intellectual force in its purer form and is satisfied only by the assent of a large and discriminating company of scholars, the rhetorical mode uses only those materials which are necessary to gain the assent of a particular group of people at a particular time and which may or may not have validity when subjected to the sterner tests of the academic mode.

Are the academic and rhetorical modes of thought really different, and if so, what are these differences and how fundamental are they? The question is an old one, but it is recurring because each generation must ask it and find an answer in terms of its own conditions. One approach to an answer is by way of an examination of the major qualities of the academic mode of thought, as we understand it today, to determine whether or not the rhetorical, too, has these qualities.

One of the primary qualities of the academic mind is an awareness that all questions cannot be placed in the same category and treated in the same manner. Some there are that can be proved somewhat conclusively; these are scien-

Elbert W. Harrington (Ph.D., State University of Iowa, 1938) is Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and Professor of Speech at the University of South Dakota.

[1] *Greek Rhetoric and Literary Criticism* (New York, 1928), p. 3.

[2] Richard McKeon, *The Basic Works of Aristotle* (New York, 1941), p. xxx.

[3] Quoted in Henry W. Johnstone, Jr., "Discussion, A New Theory of Philosophical Argumentation," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, XV (December 1954), 244, 252; from Ch. Perelman and L. Obrecht-Tyteca, *Rhetorique et Philosophie Pour Une Theorie de l'Argumentation en Philosophie* (Paris, 1952).

tific questions, and scientific people have no hesitation in seeking and presenting the answers. This is the type which, Thomas Wilson said, called for a good square rather than for a "cleane flowing tongue to set out the art."[4] Other questions are in areas in which little or no data are available; these are nonscientific questions, and scientific people are more than likely to leave them alone. If all questions with which human beings grapple were placed side by side in order of availability of data, we should have the two extremes with all the varying degrees in between. Somewhere along the line scientists stop and state that science has no way to find the answers.

Much of our speaking and writing necessarily deals with questions to which the answers are uncertain. For one reason, there are so many such questions, and for another, the rhetorical mode flourishes as an art in these uncertain areas.

Nothing in the above discussion, however, suggests any differences between the academic and rhetorical modes. One functions chiefly, although not entirely, in the area of knowledge which can be investigated objectively. The other functions chiefly, although not entirely, in the area which does not lend itself so well to objective investigation. But these facts do not make the two modes incompatible.

Another quality of the academic mode is the requirement that all data must be found and examined to establish generalizations or starting points. This requirement applies to both scientific and nonscientific questions. In both cases all the particulars must be considered.

There is no difference here between the academic and rhetorical modes. The rhetorical mode, too, rests on the examination of all the evidence, a requirement, incidentally, insisted upon by Aristotle.[5] At another time, when he said that it would be foolish to demand scientific proof from the rhetorician,[6] he probably meant to call our attention to the fact that the rhetorical mode operated in the area of uncertainty. He may have meant, too, that the rhetorician should be allowed a certain rhetorical license. The evidence submitted in much of our speaking and writing is simply illustrative in nature; for lack of time or space usually prevents more extended treatment, and the needs of the reader or hearer do not require it. So bits of evidence are given by way of example of what might be done. Some of the material might even be fictitious, as in the turn of a humorous story, the substitution of names, or the use of fables. Such rhetorical use of materials, however, is simply an adaptation to people and in nowise excuses the rhetorician from a thorough examination of all the evidence at hand.

The academic mode also involves the establishment of proper relationships among these starting points or generalizations. This process is usually called logic, and it involves not only the starting points themselves but all of the innumerable assumptions upon which they rest.

This logical process is important in dealing with any question, scientific or nonscientific; but it is more important in dealing with nonscientific questions about which little or no evidence is available, because it is the chief if not the only possible approach.

Since we speak and write about all kinds of questions but especially about

[4] *Arte of Rhetorique*, ed. George H. Mair (Oxford, 1909), p. 1.

[5] *Rhetoric*, 1396a 5-8.

[6] *Nichomachean Ethics*, 1094b 26-28.

nonscientific ones, rhetoric must always be closely related to logic. Aristotle knew this when he said that rhetoric was an offshoot of dialectic.[7] James A. Winans knew this, too, when he told students to resolve a subject into its parts, find the central idea, and relate the parts to each other and to the central idea.[8]

In rhetoric the logical process became the enthymematic process. Aristotle established this tradition. He divided knowledge into two great areas: science where the starting points were certain, and opinion where the starting points were uncertain. Rhetoric functioned in this latter area. In the one case the logical process was called the syllogism, and in the other it was called the enthymeme. The enthymeme rested on probabilities and signs.

Before Aristotle, Socrates had raised the disturbing problem, which is still with us, that probabilities are simply "that which the many think;"[9] and he questioned the effort to build an intellectual discipline that based its reasoning processes on such uncertainties. The same criticism could apply to signs for they are generally uncertain and often dwindle off into mere superstitions.

The weakness of logic as a method in any subject is that it can be made to operate with the same precision when the starting points are fantastic opinions as when the starting points are scientific certainties. A paranoiac who is under the delusion that he is Napoleon may think and act in a perfectly logical way. The really important question in logic is where we start.

The strength of logic is that it is the only method we have to establish relationships among our starting points or generalizations. Where the evidence is lacking, the logical process is our only method, and by its means a certain harmony may be achieved among the opinions of mankind.

Logic, no matter what it is called, is used, of course, in both the rhetorical and academic modes of thought. Both must use the method subject to the same limitations.

This enthymematic tradition established by Aristotle has lost much of its significance for us today. The two areas of knowledge are not as clearly defined as they were with him—the area of science has become much less certain and, because of our increased knowledge and refined methods, the area of opinion generally has become more certain. In addition, rhetoric has widened its scope, and instead of being regarded as a narrow art of persuasion, is now concerned with the proper presentation of all knowledge.

As a consequence, to us the enthymematic process has come to mean the adaptation of the logical process to oral and written presentation. This adaptation requires short cuts. Just as short cuts are necessary in presenting evidence which leads to the statement of the generalization or starting point, so they are necessary in presenting relationships among generalizations. Most audiences cannot or will not follow long, detailed, and closely-knit reasoning. In most cases such reasoning is not necessary to meet their needs. The enthymeme, therefore, has sometimes been described as the syllogism with one or more parts missing.

There is no conflict at this point between the academic and rhetorical modes of thought. No special kind of logical process for the rhetorical mode exists. One source of difficulty is that rhetoric often deals with the questions

[7] *Rhetoric*, 1356a 25-27.
[8] *Speech-Making* (New York, 1938), p. 85.
[9] *Phaedrus*, 273.

which cannot be counterchecked by specific evidence as is the case with scientific questions. Another source of difficulty is that the use of short cuts makes faulty reasoning harder to detect, especially by untrained and unsuspecting audiences. But these are not necessary conflicts.

Another quality of the academic mode of thought, which many consider the most important of all, is the attitude or state of mind. This state of mind is tentative in nature. No matter what the question is, room is always left for the possible discovery of new evidence which will overturn old theories. This tentative quality implies open-mindedness or willingness to follow where evidence leads. The second aspect of this state of mind is strict intellectual honesty, which means that the academic mind can never be satisfied except by the most detailed and careful research and can never claim more nor less than the evidence justifies. The academic mind, whatever else it is, must involve tentativeness and honesty. These points allow of no compromise.

Here the rhetorical mode of thought often departs from the academic. The tentative state of mind cannot always be adapted to the presentation of materials. Presenting materials is comparable to making a decision for action. The speaker or writer often comes to this point of action. He has to leave the tentative state of mind of the study and advance to the closed state of mind of the platform. Every executive faces the same situation in his daily work. Lincoln Steffens tells of his experience with Woodrow Wilson. At the time of the Mexican border trouble Wilson was about to make a decision which Steffens felt would not accord with all the facts. He went to Wilson and laid what additional facts he had before him. Wilson thanked him, and this time changed his decision. But Wilson said: "An executive is a man of action . . . I made up my mind long ago, when I got into my first executive job, to open my mind for awhile, hear everybody who came to me with advice, information—what you will—then, some day, the day when my mind felt like deciding, to shut it up and act."[10] Rhetoricians, too, come to the time of decision—the decision to speak or write.

This departure from the tentative quality should not carry over to the quality of honesty. The requirement of honesty must always be the same for both the academic and rhetorical modes of thought, and there is no reason why it should not be the same. It is true that in the rhetorical mode the teacher of rhetoric has a more difficult time enforcing the requirement, because of the illustrative nature of the data used, the type of subject matter treated, the nature of the audience involved, and the fact that traditions for strict honesty have not been as firmly established in the rhetorical mode as in the academic. This is a troublesome point for rhetoricians, as indicated by various efforts from those of individual instructors to committees on professional ethics and programs on demagogues; but about this requirement there can be no compromise.

Up to this point, if the major qualities of the academic mode have been properly outlined, there have been no fundamental differences between it and the rhetorical mode of thought. There have been minor departures by the rhetorical from the academic mode, but these have been due to the nature of presentation or to the differences in types of questions treated.

[10] *Autobiography of Lincoln Steffens* (New York, 1931), II, 739.

A further question remains. Does the rhetorical mode have qualities which the academic mode does not have? Years ago Aristotle listed three types of rhetorical proof—logical, pathetic, and ethical. Some people prefer to use more modern terminology, but we have discovered no proof since then that cannot properly be placed under one of these headings. So far logical proof has been considered. There remain pathetic and ethical.

Fundamentally pathetic proof, whether induced by forthright means or indirectly, as by suggestion, is based on desires of people. Emotional states or arousal of feelings stem from achieving desires or having them thwarted. Many of these desires may be understood through reasoning and the evidence available. In fact, more and more of our desires are being understood in this manner because of our refined methods and increased knowledge. In so far as they can be understood this way, they rest on questions which can be approached scientifically.

But man is an extremely complicated being. Many of his desires are in an area which cannot be approached scientifically. Many are even based on some kind of faith or trust. Some desires could be approached scientifically if it were not for the barricades of closed minds. In addition, because of failure of some people to achieve a certain harmony or unity, one desire conflicts with another to produce confusion and blind action.

Our equipment, rhetorical or otherwise, for handling questions related to all of these desires is meager. Not only is the evidence lacking to permit us to understand these desires, and not only is the method of logic one of limitations; but even if we could understand our desires perfectly, the world around us is so complicated, the problems of democracy so many, and the choices open to us so uncertain and unpredictable, that we could never be sure that the answers proposed would lead to their fulfillment. These are the reasons why pathetic proof must always be a troublesome question to rhetoricians.

Ethical proof, too, is based on the desires of people, and everything said about pathetic proof in this respect applies to ethical proof. The subject at hand is put in terms of the desires of the audience by means of the confidence which they are induced to have in the speaker or writer and his supporters, or lack of confidence in opposing groups. In this connection it will be remembered that Aristotle's qualities of ethical proof are character, intelligence, and good will.

The reliance of a society upon ethical proof is an indication of its social progress. Ethical proof is becoming more necessary every day. The individual of today is confronted with so many questions of a complex nature that he simply has to rely on the expert. On questions affecting his well-being if not his life, he has to rely on his doctor, his lawyer, his psychologist, his banker, his plumber, his electrician, and many others. He has to trust in their character, intelligence, and good will. Even scientists place their confidence in the findings of colleagues and thus create what has been called the great co-operative venture of scholars. When such confidence is induced by the written or spoken word, it is called ethical proof.

The reason ethical proof is a troublesome question for rhetoricians is that it can be so easily abused. Modern means of communication and methods of advertising can create and magnify ethical qualities to the point where the mediocre man becomes the leader, or

the demagogue becomes the hero. The audience is usually denied the opportunity to meet the speaker or writer face to face, a situation which, when it existed, was healthy. Television has helped some, but it has its limitations in permitting the audience to estimate the true ethical qualities of a speaker.

Like the short cuts used in logical proof, the use of pathetic and ethical proof is simply a means of adapting knowledge to people. Since people have desires, the subject must be put in terms of those desires. Since this is an age of specialization, we have to put our faith in specialists.

The whole process of rhetoric, in fact, is simply one of putting knowledge in such a way as to meet the needs of people. We adapt when we refrain from reciting facts they already know. We adapt when we avoid long detailed chains of reasoning where such reasoning is not necessary or practicable. We adapt when we put our subject in terms of their desires. In like manner, every teacher should adapt to the needs of his students, and every parent to the needs of his children. Long ago, Plato said that we should put matters simply for simple natures and in a more complex manner for complex natures.[11]

At no point in these adaptations, however, is there any justification for a departure from the spirit or the methods of the academic mode. Rhetoric at its best has always rested on sound subject matter, a tradition that goes back at least to Isocrates, Plato, and Aristotle. At any time in the process, unless the data or reasoning are unsound, we should be able to transform these rhetorical adaptations into their full academic equivalents, from which they originated or should have originated, without doing violence to our intellectual capacities.

If rhetoric is so regarded, there can be no real basis of antagonism between rhetoricians and academicians. Antagonisms will develop, however, when enthusiastic but misguided rhetoricians view rhetoric as an art of persuasion which has no particular relationship to the academic mode of thought.

Antagonisms will develop, too, when rhetoric is abused or dishonored. Even Plato allowed this reason to serve as the basis of most of his criticism, although he was clear about the real nature of rhetoric. Aristotle avoided Plato's mistake. Rhetoric, he held, is not the only gift to man that can be abused; so can health, wealth, strength, military skill, and many other virtues.[12]

Modern rhetoricians are much concerned about this abuse of rhetoric. They are doing everything they can in their teaching and in their professional organizations to condemn the demagogue and charlatan and to build a widespread practice and appreciation of responsible speaking and writing. Their failure to achieve perfection or even a satisfactory condition, however, is not a valid criticism of rhetoric or rhetoricians. Such failure really reveals the status of our understanding and appreciation of the academic mode of thought.

It is important that all of us understand the nature, purposes, and limitations of both the rhetorical and academic modes of thought. As to the rhetoricians, they should first of all be academicians. They should note carefully at what points and how far the rhetorical mode departs from the academic. As to the academicians, they should realize that ideas without action are barren, and that rhetoric is often necessary to protect the right to have ideas.

[11] *Phaedrus*, 277.

[12] *Rhetoric*, 1355[b] 3-7.

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF [u-ʊ] VARIANTS IN THE SAN FRANCISCO AND LOS ANGELES AREAS

John P. Moncur

I

IN recent years much attention has been given, in other parts of the country, to the nature and distribution of [u-ʊ] variants as they occur in such words as *hoof, took,* and *wool.* The majority of these studies have been based upon field records collected in various regional divisions of the Linguistic Atlas of the United States. McDavid, for example, has made an analysis of the derivatives of Middle English [o:] in the South Atlantic States, basing his study on the group of words employing orthographic *oo* as recorded in the field records of the Linguistic Atlas for that area.[1]

Before making a study of [u-ʊ] variants, I should like to point out that the Linguistic Atlas of the Pacific Coast has proceeded in a different manner with regard to coverage of urban areas from that used elsewhere in the United States; in our region greater emphasis has been placed upon densely populated districts. More informants have been interviewed in Los Angeles and San Francisco than in cities of comparable size in other regions. This proportion was maintained for a number of reasons: (1) to insure a sufficient body of information for rural-urban analysis; (2) to provide for intra-regional comparisons of urban areas; and (3) to give more adequate coverage to the various age, racial, social, and educational groups within each urban area.

After a five-year period of research, resulting in the completion of a substantial number of field interviews in the San Francisco Bay and Los Angeles areas, sufficient data had been collected to make a rather complete study of the nature and distribution of [u-ʊ] variants in these two regions of California. I should like here to discuss the procedure followed in that study, to comment upon findings and results, and to state the conclusions reached.

II

After making a preliminary survey of other regional studies with regard to [u-ʊ] words, I selected from the work sheets of the Linguistic Atlas of the Pacific Coast a list of such words similar to those studied elsewhere in the country. The great majority of words in this list are derivatives, like McDavid's, of Middle English [o:], employing orthographic *oo,* as in *soot* and *roof;* however, a few (such as *pull, push,* and *humor*) do not belong to this category but were included as words which might reveal differences in pronunciation between the Pacific Coast and the rest of the country.

The primary source of information for the present study was, of course, the

John P. Moncur is Assistant Professor of Speech at the University of California, Los Angeles. He is currently engaged in field work in California and Nevada and is the Associate Director and Associate Editor of the Linguistic Atlas of the Pacific Coast.

[1] Raven I. McDavid, Jr., "Derivatives of Middle English [o:] in the South Atlantic Area," *QJS,* XXXV (December 1949), 494-504.

field records of the Linguistic Atlas of the Pacific Coast. Of the thirty-one interviews included for study in the Bay area, twenty-five were completed by DeCamp for San Francisco,[2] and six were recorded by Reed in the East Bay region;[3] in Los Angeles, Freestone's seven interviews collected in East Los Angeles[4] were added to Moncur's thirty field records taken in the central and western parts of the city, making a total of thirty-seven interviews available for study in the area as a whole.[5] Reed's and Freestone's interviews were included in the San Francisco and Los Angeles collections for two reasons: (1) to enlarge the number of interviews studied in both areas, and (2) to reduce to a minimum individual differences in phonetic transcription as an operative factor influencing the results.

After careful consideration, the following words were selected for detailed analysis: *roots, soot, took, roof, hoops, hoofs/hooves, broom, store room, living room, good morning, wool, pull, push,* and *humor.* The results on these words were then tabulated from the field records and are presented in the table. Only five columns are used in this table to report the findings; in some instances, however, as many as twelve different notations were used to record the results on a single word. If I were to record all of the notations for all words, more than twenty different columns would have been required to report the findings. Furthermore, such a table would be complicated, impractical, and confusing from the standpoint of a comparative analysis. A more feasible plan for reporting the findings was to combine the minor variants on given words into five slightly larger categories, each of which was composed of closely related variants. This procedure allows the reader to observe major differences with ease and simplifies the over-all analysis of the variants. Since the total number of field records included in the present study is insufficient for statistical analysis, no attempt was made to establish their validity in this manner.

III

The table reveals that the greatest differences between the two urban areas occur on the words, *roots, roof, hoofs/hooves,* and *hoops.* In all pronunciations there is a tendency for those living in the Los Angeles area to lower [u] in the direction of [ʊ]. This is particularly observable on the words *roots* and *roof,* where nearly 50 per cent of the responses in the Los Angeles area were recorded as [ʊ], as compared to only 22.5 and 35 per cent (on *roots* and *roof,* respectively) in the Bay area.

While the majority of the groups in Los Angeles and San Francisco were recorded as having used [ʊ] in the pronunciation of *hoofs/hooves,* 29 per cent of those reared in the north used [u] as compared to only 15 per cent in the south.

A wide majority of both groups were recorded as pronuncing *hoops,* [hups]. In the Bay area this pronunciation was used by 90 per cent, whereas in Los Angeles it was used by only 72.3 per cent. Here again one may observe a larger percentage of those living in the south as using [ʊ] in preference to [u].

The pronunciation of the word *soot* yielded a small difference between the areas under study. All those questioned

[2] David DeCamp, Assistant Professor of English, Washington State College.

[3] David W. Reed, Director and Editor of the Linguistic Atlas of the Pacific Coast, University of California, Berkeley.

[4] Norman Freestone, Professor of Speech, Occidental College.

[5] All field records are the property of the University of California and are housed at Berkeley.

RESPONSES ON SELECTED [u-ʊ] WORDS IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AND LOS ANGELES AREAS

Item	Place	No.	Variants*				
			u	u^v	U	U^v	A
roots	SF	31	23	1	7	0	0
	LA	37	19	2	15	1	0
roof	SF	31	20	0	11	0	0
	LA	37	18	1	17	1	0
hoofs	SF	31	9	1	21	0	0
hooves	LA	37	5	4	27	1	0
hoops	SF	31	28	0	3	0	0
	LA	36	26	4	3	3	0
soot	SF	31	0	0	31	0	0
	LA	36	2	2	28	2	2
broom	SF	31	21	5	5	0	0
	LA	36	28	4	4	0	0
store	SF	31	28	3	0	0	0
room	LA	32	31	0	0	1	0
living	SF	31	30	0	1	0	0
room	LA	27	0	0	0	0	0
good	SF	30	0	0	27	1	2
morning	LA	33	0	0	32	0	1
took	SF	31	0	0	31	0	0
	LA	37	0	0	36	1	0
wool	SF	31	0	2	20	3	6*
	LA	37	0	5	31	1	0
pull	SF	31	0	1	25	0	5*
	LA	37	1	1	35	0	0
push	SF	31	0	0	30	1	0
	LA	37	0	0	37	0	0
humor	SF	31	0	0	0	0	0
	LA	32	1	1	0	0	0

*The simplified symbols at the head of each cloumn represent a slightly wider range of variants than is indicated. Column one, [u], also includes [u̟], [u˖], and [ɨʉ] ; column two, [u˅], includes [ʊ̟] [u˅], and [ʊ̟]; column three, [ʊ], also includes [ɨʉ]; column four includes [ʊ̟] and [ʊ˅] and modified variants. DeCamp's [wɬ] and [pɬ] have been combined with column five in order to eliminate a sixth column.

in the Bay area responded [sʊt], without exception, while in Los Angeles, a wide range of pronunciation was noted, but 78 per cent replied [sʊt] as everyone did in the north. Two persons in Los Angeles and one in San Francisco replied that they had once used *smut,* either as a second choice or as an early family term.

Very small differences in pronunciation, or none at all, exist between the two groups on the words *broom, living room, store room, good morning, took, push,* and *humor.* Thus, the table reveals remarkable uniformity in the distribution of the responses of the two groups on these words.

A difference in responses was noted on the words *wool* and *pull.* On the word *wool,* DeCamp recorded seven of his twenty-five informants in San Francisco as having replied [wʊl] and six [wl]; Reed, Freestone, and Moncur, in a total of forty-three interviews, did not record a single informant as having replied in this manner. Whether the differences are real or are the result of a difference in individual transcription is open to question. It may be that DeCamp is entirely correct in his transcription, and that his observations may be the basis of a real difference in pronunciation between San Francisco speech and that of East Bay and Los

Angeles. On the other hand, the difference may be based upon the enigmatic problem of arbitrary transcription. Inasmuch as tape recordings were not made at the time of the interviews, the question cannot be fully resolved. At the time of the San Francisco interviews, Reed stated that he was not fully in accord with DeCamp with regard to DeCamp's transcription of *wool* and *pull*, and some discussion arose as to how they could straighten out their differences. I am inclined to agree with Reed that the difference is one of transcription rather than informants.

IV

Admittedly, the foregoing findings are insufficient to formulate valid conclusions regarding the use of [u] and [ʊ] on the words selected for study in the San Francisco Bay and Los Angeles areas. One may, however, point to a rather definite trend which emerges from an analysis of the data, namely, that where differences occur on [u] and [ʊ] words, informants in the Los Angeles area tend to prefer variants of the latter vowel, whereas in San Francisco the former vowel is more characteristic. The four words revealing the greatest difference, *roots, roof, hoops, hoofs/hooves*, all follow this general trend.

This does not mean, however, that all [u-ʊ] words follow this characteristic pattern. There is ample evidence that many such words in the two areas under study are handled alike and that no differences are observable.

It cannot be concluded from the data that differences in field workers contributed to the differences established between the two urban areas under consideration, for quite the opposite appears to be true. The uniformity in the distribution of the responses of both groups suggests a high degree of reliability among those taking phonetic transcription in the two areas. The agreement, in turn, gives greater credence to the differences established between the Los Angeles and the San Francisco groups. In other words, the results on the whole are not distributed dissimilarly in either area, and the evenness of distribution means that when a difference occurs, it is more likely to be real, not a mere difference in observers.

DO NOT UNDERRATE YOUR AUDIENCE

> Never despise those whom you address, whatever you may think of their intellectual attainments. Give them the best you have to give. You need not talk over their heads, as I once heard an eminent English historian, when he was candidate for a seat in Parliament, discourse to agricultural labourers upon the Landesgemeinde of the Forest Cantons of Switzerland. But you will find it politic as well as polite to respect them, and you must never think that your best thoughts, expressed in the fittest words, are too good for them. Though noisy and empty rhetoric will often draw cheers, still the masses of the common people almost always appreciate solid and relevant facts, sound and useful thoughts, stated in language they can understand, and there will probably be among them those who would perceive and resent any indication that you were talking down to their inferior capacity.
>
> James Bryce, "Some Hints on Public Speaking," in *University and Historical Addresses* (London and New York, 1913), p. 289.

HILLIARD vs. YANCEY: PRELUDE TO THE CIVIL WAR

James L. Golden

WHILE on his way to observe a joint debate between William L. Yancey and Henry W. Hilliard, youthful Joel Bartlett listened with enthusiasm to the conversations of his elders as they awaited the "Battle of the Giants." Yancey, they said, was "the Demosthenes of fiery and impetuous speech," Hilliard, "the polished and faultless Cicero."[1] This glowing description, which fired the boyish imagination of Bartlett, summarizes well the appreciation with which Alabamians in 1851 had come to view the talents of their two most famous orators.

For twenty years preceding the Civil War, the debates of these two men, according to Yancey's biographer DuBose, "were more impressive than distinguished stump speaking elsewhere . . . in America."[2] Moreover, they were the major force which made Montgomery a center of political thought in the ante-bellum South.

Of the numerous contests between them, none surpassed in ardor, in interest, and in importance, the campaign which took place in the Second Congressional District of Alabama in the summer of 1851. Forty years after that campaign ended, DuBose was able to say that "men yet living" often retell "the scenes of this extraordinary debate."[3]

James L. Golden (Ph.D., Florida, 1953) is Professor of Speech at Pasadena College.

[1] Joel Bartlett, "Recollections of William L. Yancey," Montgomery *Daily Advertiser*, July 18, 1914.

[2] John W. DuBose, *The Life and Times of William L. Yancey* (Birmingham, 1892), p. 185. Cited below as *Life of Yancey*.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 265.

At the time of their meeting in 1851, Hilliard and Yancey had gained nationwide recognition both as orators and as political leaders. Indeed, so effective was Hilliard in the presidential and congressional campaigns in the 1840's that he was dubbed the "Hercules of the Whig Party," and was eulogized in the *American Review*, a national Whig journal published in New York.[4] His equally effective performance in Congress (1845-1851) led him to be ranked with Robert Toombs and Alexander Stephens as the most influential Southern Whig in Washington. It is not surprising, then, that when Secretary of State Daniel Webster sought for the last time to advance his own presidential fortunes in the spring of 1851, he maneuvered for Hilliard's direct support, despite his neglect of his earlier promise to appoint Hilliard to a diplomatic post in Russia. "We have another struggle to go thro!," Webster told Hilliard. "In that contest you will be needed, you will be wanted in the convention, by which a candidate, under whatever title, may be designated."[5]

While Hilliard was winning applause throughout the Union for his efforts on behalf of the Whigs, Yancey was becoming an important force in the Democratic Party. Like Hilliard, he effectively stated his ideas in the political campaigns of the 1840's and in his terms

[4] *American Review*, X (1849), 611-620.

[5] Daniel Webster to Henry W. Hilliard, New York, April 7, 1851; in Daniel Webster, *Writings and Speeches* (Boston, 1903), XVI, 607.

in Congress.[6] Perhaps his most notable achievement during this period was his authorship of the Alabama Platform—a series of addresses denouncing the antislavery provisions of the Wilmot Proviso. These addresses and his subsequent speeches placed Yancey at the head and front of the southern rights movement in the lower South. In the years which followed, masses thronged to hear him as he eloquently set forth what he believed to be the constitutional rights of his section.[7]

But the prestige of Hilliard and Yancey was not enough in itself to account for the extreme popularity of the great debates in 1851. More important were the issues and the occasion. The paramount question to be settled was whether the people of Alabama should accept the 1850 compromise measures passed by Congress and already endorsed by the Georgia Legislature, or follow the example of the leaders of South Carolina and threaten to secede from the Union. Hilliard made his decision in January, 1851, when he became one of the forty-four senators and representatives from all parts of the country who signed the Union pledge, thus giving his unconditional support to the compromise provisions.[8] To Yancey, however, the compromise meant destruction to the South. He told the Southern Rights Association in May, 1851, "that the only issue before the people was secession."[9] With this bold declaration the stage was set for a preliminary rehearsal of what was to become the "irrepressible conflict" of 1860-1861.

The newly organized Unionist and Southern Rights parties met respectively in April and May of 1851 to choose candidates for the congressional election.[10] Both Hilliard and Yancey were offered their party's nomination, but they declined to run. Consequently the Unionists nominated James Abercrombie, a Whig, while the Southern Rights Party selected an ardent secessionist, John Cochran. It soon became evident, however, that these nominees were to play but minor roles in the pending struggle. After an extensive survey of the district the Unionists felt that they could not cope with the secession sentiment unless they employed the services of Hilliard. Persuaded to help, the latter immediately published a list of twelve speaking appointments.

As soon as the itinerary was announced, the Southern Rights leaders urged Yancey to meet Hilliard in debate. But Hilliard emphatically stated that he had no intention of entering a heated contest, since he was not a candidate for office. This prompted the secessionist organ, the Montgomery *Atlas and Banner*, to denounce Hilliard's statement as "miserable language of the sneaking, designing, unprincipled demagogue, whose sole object . . . is to dupe, to cheat, bamboozle, and mislead the people in reference to the leading questions now before the coun-

[6] Elected to Congress in 1844, he resigned in 1846 during his second term.

[7] Hilliard regarded Yancey "as the most powerful advocate of the Southern-rights doctrine to be found in the whole country." See his *Politics and Pen Pictures at Home and Abroad* (New York, 1892), p. 255. Cited below as *Politics and Pen Pictures*.

[8] On the 20th of December Hilliard wrote Appleton: "I should really regard a disruption of the Union as leaving us little in the name of *country* worth taking care of—or being proud of." Hilliard to Nathan Appleton, Washington, December 20, 1850; in Appleton Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, Massachusetts.

[9] Joseph Hodgson, *The Cradle of the Confederacy* (Mobile, 1876), pp. 304-305.

[10] Following the passage of the compromise measures many people of Alabama abandoned their party affiliations. Those who favored the compromise formally organized a Union Party on January 9, 1851, whereas Southern ultras joined forces in early February to form the Southern Rights Party.

try."[11] The *Alabama Journal,* long friendly to the Whig cause, was quick to reply that those who thought that Hilliard "can be intimidated, will find, as they have often found, *that they have caught a tartar.*"[12]

While the controversy continued among the local editors, Hilliard delivered in Chambers County an address in which he established the position he was to take in the campaign. After giving the history of each compromise provision, he pointed out how he had voted. Not only were these measures in accord with the Constitution, he added, but they advanced the position of the South as far as slavery was concerned. He then concluded that no state had a lawful right to secede from the Union. The audience, comprised of Unionists and "fire eaters" alike, reacted favorably to the speech. The *Chambers Tribune,* not at all sympathetic to the Unionist cause, observed that "we never saw an audience give more undivided attention to any speaker."[13]

Encouraged by his success at Chambers, Hilliard proceeded to his first scheduled appointment at Union Springs. When he arrived, he found, much to his surprise, that Yancey and many of his followers were on the grounds clamoring for a chance to reply. Hilliard thereupon suggested that a committee be appointed to work out the details for a debate. After an animated discussion it was decided that each speaker should have an hour and three quarters for his constructive speech and half an hour for rebuttal. Difficulties occurred, however, over the speaking order, when both men wanted the closing speech. But, since it was Hilliard's appointment, Yancey finally yielded.

As the speakers mounted the platform "the sun shone with splendor upon a beautiful landscape, and large numbers of carriages were drawn near the stand, while the improvised seats were filled with people."[14] Those who had not seen the orators before were impressed with the dramatic contrast. The forty-three year old Hilliard was a slender man of average height. His complexion was dark, his temperament bilious. He had a quick and restless eye, and a forehead which retreated rapidly on a small head. Elegant, commanding, and courtly, he was, in the opinion of a contemporary, "a man to stand before the king."[15] By contrast, Yancey, then thirty-seven years of age, was at first glance unprepossessing. He was short in stature and not too handsome despite a well-shaped face and fine muscular development. His plain and simple clothes, as Henry Foote remarked, "did not always fit him as well as they might have done."[16] In all, there was in his person "but little to impress the casual beholder, or to kindle the sympathies of those who had no special commune with him."[17]

Amid cheers from the assemblage, Yancey rose to speak. He first chided Hilliard for his reluctance to engage in debate and complained that the speaking order should be reversed, since it was his rather than Hilliard's duty to tear down and refute. Then he became more serious, and began to oppose the compromise bills *en masse.*

[11] Montgomery *Atlas and Banner,* quoted in the Eufaula *Spirit of the South,* July 8, 1851.

[12] Montgomery *Alabama Journal,* July 12, 1851.

[13] Lafayette *Chambers Tribune,* June 20, 1851.

[14] Hilliard, *Politics and Pen Pictures,* pp. 251-252.

[15] William R. Smith, *Reminiscences of a Long Life* (Washington, 1887), p. 219.

[16] Henry S. Foote, *The Bench and Bar of the South and Southwest* (St. Louis, 1876), p. 235. Cited below as *Bench and Bar of the South.*

[17] *Ibid.,* p. 235.

He took issue with the arguments of Hilliard's Chambers County speech—particularly the statement pertaining to the South's advancement. He quoted Webster as saying that the South had lost everything in the compromise except her honor. Providing two-thirds of the fighting forces in the Mexican War, the South, declared Yancey, had not received two-thirds of the acquired territory, and thus the time for immediate secession had arrived.

Yancey next attacked Hilliard for being a "man of peace" and for having a friendly attitude toward leaders of the North. He reminded the audience that when the abolition guns, bonfires, and illuminations in Washington celebrated the passage of the compromise measures, Hilliard was in the company of Webster "congratulating the abolition procession."[18] And he closed by boasting: "Well . . . I have said enough for Mr. Hilliard to chew on for ten hours, and I'll quit."[19]

Hilliard then rose to reply. He began by asserting his original desire to speak without encountering an antagonist, and by declaring that the discussion had been forced upon him against his better judgment. He cited the various acts of Congress from 1787 through 1850 on the subject of slavery. In his analysis of the Oregon controversy he emphasized that Yancey had voted for the Oregon bill even though the anti-slavery Wilmot Proviso was attached to it. Turning to the compromise measures, he asserted that they, when considered in entirety, guaranteed to the South greater rights than she had held during the last thirty years.

Hilliard then turned to Yancey and said: "The gentleman taunts me as a man of peace, fellow citizens. I desire no higher distinction than to be recognized as an humble follower of the Prince of Peace, but the gentleman is a man of war, and he comes forth to seek an antagonist in a man of Peace!"[20] He concluded that Yancey was sincere in his desire to dissolve the Union, but that such action could only end in a bloody civil war, and that such a war, if it came, would destroy the freest government on earth.

During his speech Hilliard's movements were easy, graceful, and energetic. He stood erect; he gestured freely with his head and arms; he did not walk or stamp his feet. "The general effect of his oratory," wrote one newspaper correspondent, "is heightened by a voice highly cultivated and susceptible of indefinite and expressive modulation."[21] An enthusiastic contemporary found Hilliard's voice so rich and musical that it was worth "going the full length of the state to hear him pronounce the word 'Alabama.'"[22]

Nor was Yancey's delivery less effective. He had a clear, sonorous, and strong voice "under his absolute control."[23] Like Hilliard, he "commonly spoke in the conversational tone" and "enunciated every word and syllable distinctly."[24] Thus he could make himself heard to thousands in the open air "without any apparent physical labor."[25] Control was even more evident in his bodily activity. Despite strong impulse and deep emotion, he employed

[18] Eufaula *Spirit of the South*, July 15, 1851.
[19] Montgomery *Alabama Journal*, July 12, 1851.
[20] Recollections of H. W. Hilliard by Benjamin Gardner; in Hilliard Papers, Alabama State Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, Alabama.
[21] Newark *Evening Journal*, September 8, 1860.
[22] Arthur C. Cole, *Whig Party in the South* (Washington, 1914), p. 81.
[23] Montgomery *Advertiser*, November 15, 1885.
[24] Foote, *Bench and Bar of the South*, p. 238.
[25] DuBose, *Life of Yancey*, p. 190.

few gestures and "seldom occupied more than a yard square of space through the longest of his addresses."[26] He stood firm and dignified, wrote one eyewitness, "as if to remind his hearers that his position was impregnable."[27] Yet, while his overt action was limited, it was apt and impressive—particularly when it was used to mark a climax or drive home an argument. The over-all effect of his delivery was tremendous. Not since Patrick Henry, thought Hilliard, had any speaker exhibited such a high degree of vehemence.[28]

The debate at Union Springs held the audience for five hours. When it was over, opinion on the merits of the speaking divided along party lines. The *Alabama Journal* reported that at least eighteen persons, "heretofore ranked with fire eaters, profess their determination to vote the Union ticket."[29] The *Spirit of the South*, however, asserted that Yancey's triumph was so complete that "no one was astonished that Hilliard had been afraid of discussion—the only surprise was that he had been dragged into it at all."[30] Actually, both men had spoken well, but not altogether with a genuine clash of views. Some of Yancey's friends tacitly agreed with a Unionist sympathizer who claimed that Yancey had failed to come to grips with the real issues. But they hastened to predict that "he would get into the merits of the great question before he quit."[31]

On the following day when the speakers arrived at the village of Enon, about twenty-five miles from Union Springs, they were greeted by a larger and more enthusiastic crowd. Yancey's friends immediately renewed their demand to have him speak last in the debate; but Hilliard was adamant. As a result, the discussion proceeded on the same terms as those at Union Springs the day before.

Aware that he perhaps had failed to deal with some of the pertinent issues in his first debate, Yancey made certain that a similar charge would not be made against him at Enon. Proceeding at once to the heart of the controversy, he spelled out the South's grievances. While he admitted that slaves could be carried to California, Utah, New Mexico, or even to the District of Columbia, he denied that they could be taken from these territories as slave property. Nor could they be sold in any of these areas as slaves. Moreover, he criticized Congress for admitting California as a state with a constitution framed by the Mexicans and other foreigners—few of whom spoke the English language or understood the laws of the United States.

Yancey then pointed out that a state had an abstract right to regain the power which it had delegated to the Union. The history of the last fifty years, he added, had clearly demonstrated the desire of the free states to strengthen the central government for the sole purpose of destroying the slave states. Thus action must be taken, said Yancey, to reduce the power of the central government, and if action failed, Alabama would have a constitutional right to secede.

In refutation, Hilliard examined each of the compromise bills in an effort to substantiate his claim that they not only were in accord with the sentiment of the Constitution, but had improved the position of the South. At the conclusion of this argument he again read

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 190.
[27] W. C. Richardson, "Hilliard and Yancey—A Parallel," Montgomery *Advertiser*, November 8, 1908.
[28] Hilliard, *Politics and Pen Pictures*, p. 255.
[29] Montgomery *Alabama Journal*, July 19, 1851.
[30] Eufaula *Spirit of the South*, July 15, 1851.
[31] Montgomery *Alabama Journal*, July 12, 1851.

from the Washington *Globe* to show that Yancey had voted for the Oregon Bill, subject as it was to the provisions of the Wilmot Proviso. Obviously pleased with the reaction produced by this reference, Hilliard stressed the significance of Yancey's vote. How could a man who poses as the true friend of the South, he asked, vote for a proviso which Calhoun had called the greatest of all the aggressions against the South?[32]

Hilliard next turned to an important question—whether or not a state had a right to secede. There was nothing in the Constitution which guaranteed that right, he argued. Of course, the people could not stand idly by while the charter of their liberties was violated. Undoubtedly they should demand their rights, and if that demand were not met, it would be incumbent upon them to overthrow their government. Hilliard did not believe that this action, violent as it may seem, was unconstitutional. He held that if a state attempted to take from the government those powers which it had previously delegated to that government, the Constitution would be violated. He then concluded that "if Alabama be called upon to assist in the reduction of South Carolina, he for one would remember that he had a double duty to perform—a duty to his state and a duty to the Union."[33]

At the close of the debate, both sides claimed victory. The *Spirit of the South* confidently asserted that "if ever a man was annihilated by argument—if ever a man was crushed by proofs—that man was Henry W. Hilliard."[34] The *Alabama Journal* replied: "The defeat [of Yancey] was total—'it was a Waterloo.' "[35] More discerning critics agreed that neither speaker could boast an advantage. Both men were more effective than they had been at Union Springs; both displayed a degree of eloquence which did justice to their reputations. As one contemporary put it: "Wit rebounded against wit, sarcasm foiled sarcasm; metaphor, illustration, syllogism . . . wrought to frenzy the partisans, now of this orator and then of the other."[36]

The two contestants met the next day at Glennville for their third meeting. At ten o'clock that morning a procession of more than two hundred on horseback met Hilliard a few miles from Glennville. "With a noble banner of the stars and stripes floating at their head," they led their champion into town.[37] In the meantime Yancey along with many of his followers had arrived, and necessary arrangements were made for the debate.

Until now the speakers had been conciliatory toward each other. It seemed evident, however, that as Yancey opened his speech at Glennville, a friendly spirit would no longer prevail. Chafed by Hilliard's repeated references to the Oregon vote, Yancey tried to ex-

[32] On the surface it would appear that Hilliard placed undue emphasis upon Yancey's vote on the Oregon question. Actually, Yancey had voted to strike out the antislavery clause attached to the bill, but when it was eventually embodied in the bill, he voted for the measure. In refusing to overlook Yancey's action, Hilliard defended his position as follows: "When in the presence of great bodies of the people, he [Yancey] arraigned the Whig party for its opinions and denounced their policy as hostile to the South, I thought it proper at length to say it seemed to me that the gentleman himself should be more tolerant in his judgment of his political opponents; that while I did not doubt the gentleman's loyalty to the South, he had himself conceded the authority of Congress to exclude slavery from a territory of the Union by voting for a measure forbidding its introduction." Hilliard, *Politics and Pen Pictures*, p. 254.

[33] DuBose, *Life of Yancey*, p. 264.

[34] Eufaula *Spirit of the South*, July 15, 1851.

[35] Montgomery *Alabama Journal*, July 19, 1851.

[36] DuBose, *Life of Yancey*, p. 265.

[37] Montgomery *Alabama Journal*, July 26, 1851.

plain that he had voted merely to *admit* that territory. Doubtless he intended to use the word *organize*, but inadverdently he said *admit* instead. When Hilliard replied, he pounced upon this statement, and Yancey, not realizing that he had said *admit*, leaped to his feet and emphatically stated that he had said no such thing. Partisan feeling was strong, and for a moment it appeared that a riot would ensue. But Hilliard calmed the crowd, observes one eyewitness, by turning to Yancey and quietly rebuking him for his offensive manner.[38] Fortunately, the debate was concluded without any further interruptions.

Eufaula was the next stop on Hilliard's list of speaking appointments, and it was understood that the fourth encounter would take place there. The debates by now had attracted widespread interest southward to the Florida line and eastward into Georgia. Many people from remote areas arrived in Eufaula almost twenty-four hours before the discussion was scheduled to begin. But when the committees met to work out plans for the debate in Eufaula, they learned that Hilliard had withdrawn from the contest. Disturbed by the events of the preceding day, he asserted that he would not engage in further joint discussions unless Yancey publicly apologized for his actions at Glennville.

When Yancey heard of Hilliard's intentions, he told a group of one thousand of his followers—including one hundred and fifty ladies—who had assembled in the market house:

> I understand that my honorable opponent declines this discussion, because, as he says, I used discourteous language towards him at Glennville. . . . If anything I may have said to that gentleman at Glennville grated harshly upon his feelings, it was not in consequence of the manner of the language I employed; it was because only he felt, and he knew that it was backed and based upon truth. Nor must he expect his clerical character to protect him—nor hope when borne upon by a contest which he provoked, to wrap himself up in his priestly robe for security. No, gentlemen, I am incapable of insulting a clergyman, so long as he acts the clergyman—but when he folds up his bible in his gown, and throwing these aside at home, mounts the stump, and takes the field, the champion of measures which I regard as ruinous to the safety and honor of my country—in behalf of that country, I shall meet him and give battle—and he must not complain, if in the struggle my lance pierce through the cassock to his heart.[39]

Since this statement could not be interpreted as an apology, the debate at Eufaula was not held. "Never," observed DuBose, "was an audience doomed to greater disappointment."[40]

For the next few days editorials appeared in the opposing newspapers under the caption, "Who backed out?" Hilliard was accused of a "craven heartedness, worthy of the cause he advocated."[41] Yancey was berated for his use of uncouth language and his inability to take criticism.[42] While the editors hurled epithets with increasing fury, Hilliard and Yancey met and, much to the delight of partisans on both sides, adjusted their difficulties.

Not much was new in the mode of reasoning or in the nature of the evidence as the speakers reiterated their cases in the ensuing weeks at Camp Ground, Columbia, Woodville, Abbeville, Skippersville, Louisville, Clayton, Fergan's, Missouri, and Montgomery. Hilliard appealed for action which

[38] Benjamin Gardner to Miss Tocopa Cozart, April 7, 1901; in Hilliard Papers, Alabama State Department of Archives and History, Montgomery, Alabama.

[39] Eufaula *Spirit of the South*, July 15, 1851. Yancey was alluding to the fact that Hilliard had served occasionally as an itinerant minister of the Methodist Church.

[40] DuBose, *Life of Yancey*, p. 265.

[41] Eufaula *Spirit of the South*, July 15, 1851.

[42] Eufaula *Shield*, quoted in Montgomery *Alabama Journal*, July 26, 1851.

would save the Union; Yancey pleaded for an equitable settlement based on Southern rights. As the canvass drew to a close, the *Spirit of the South* said of Hilliard: "His eulogies on the Union were exceedingly eloquent — we never heard any one perform in that way, better. Daniel Webster plays pretty well on the Union key, but Mr. Hilliard beats him all hollow, and when the former gentleman becomes weary of playing the same tune, we can recommend him to employ Mr. Hilliard as a substitute."[43] To offset these pleas for patriotism, Yancey, who could see little but the disadvantages which the Union imposed upon the South, pointed out with "unanswerable" logic the need for "a duty of resistance."[44]

Although the pattern of the debate varied little during the closing weeks, there was a noticeable change in the pre-debate festivities. Both parties sang lively campaign songs as they escorted their speakers to the field, and on the field itself the efforts of the rival singers came into open and confusing competition. Success in this musical debate, of course, went to the side which could produce the greater volume.

To supplement their vocal power the Southern Rights adherents employed a band from Eufaula which appeared at that town and at all subsequent meetings. As it played, the secessionists rent the air with words set to the tune of the popular song, "Susannah":

> We live in Alabama
> 'Mongst the noble and the free,
> We'll go to Carolina
> To meet the enemy.
> It may be we shall die there,
> But happy it will be,
> To spend our latest efforts
> In the cause of liberty.
>
> Oh Carolina,
> That's the land for me;
> Of all the lands in the
> Sunny South
> Carolina, still for me.[45]

Yancey and Hilliard concluded their joint discussions in Montgomery a few days before the election. There they engaged in an animated debate which summed up all the issues of the campaign. Commenting on this meeting, the *Alabama Journal* observed: "The debate was one of great interest, holding the earnest attention of the audience for five hours. It was a struggle of giants—both were worthy champions." The writer then added that "everything was . . . in the best feeling between the gentlemen."[46]

After the contest between Hilliard and Yancey had ended, the people of Alabama began to draw comparisons not only between the issues represented by the two men, but also between their styles of eloquence. Yancey was characterized as a "newborn Demosthenes" and Hilliard as "a revivified Cicero." Yancey excelled, observed one listener, "in all that was fierce, stormy, vituperative, denunciatory, impetuous, and scornful." Hilliard, on the other hand, was unquestionably better "in all that was soft and smooth and easy, graceful and persuasive."[47]

Yancey opened his speeches in a courteous and pleasing manner, revealing little of the latent passions of his nature. As he advanced into his argument he "presented great intellectual force in the statements of his propositions," and exhibited a "bold earnestness" which gave him tremendous power.[48] All who heard him were impressed with the

[43] Eufaula *Spirit of the South*, July 22, 1851.
[44] *Ibid.*, July 22, 1851.
[45] *Ibid.*, July 29, 1851.
[46] Montgomery *Alabama Journal*, August 9, 1851.
[47] Smith, *Reminiscences of a Long Life*, p. 223.
[48] Hilliard, *Politics and Pen Pictures*, p. 255.

strength of his logic, his passionate appeals, and his invective. Moreover, they liked the apt illustrations and "high-sounding" phrases which he used to enforce his conclusions.[49] Hilliard—always calm and self-possessed — derived much of his power from different sources. While at Columbia College in the 1820's he developed an interest in the classics, English literature, and American history, which remained with him throughout his public life. Thus whenever he spoke he displayed profound knowledge, and dignity and force of expression. Similarly, he excelled in narrating pathetic stories, describing battle scenes, and employing literary and historical allusions. The people of the Second Congressional District of Alabama, observed one contemporary, "have no need of an American historian. Even the flowery pages of Weems would seem tame and dull to him who has listened to the glowing eloquence of Hilliard."[50] Possessing vastly different speaking styles, Hilliard and Yancey, nevertheless, were considered equally effective.[51] In short, it was generally agreed that "there was no match for the one save in the other."[52]

With two evenly matched orators debating such a crucial question in the heart of the Black Belt, it was difficult to predict the outcome of the election. For years the Second Congressional District had been the home both of wealthy planters and of Southern ultras. So equally divided were these two groups —the Whig planter and the Democrat small farmer — that every election throughout the 1840's was extremely close. Pitted against a lesser opponent than Yancey, Hilliard was re-elected to Congress in 1849 by a small margin of eight hundred votes. And the margin of victory in 1845 was even less.

But while the voters had difficulty in making up their minds on less critical issues in the past, they—much to the surprise of political analysts on both sides—did not hesitate in choosing between unionism and secession in 1851. The Unionist Whig, James Abercrombie, received 7,598 votes while the secessionist, John Cochran, received 5,911. Not only was this seventeen hundred vote majority greater than that which Hilliard had received in his previous congressional contests, but it represented almost one-half of the aggregate majority of the seven unionist candidates throughout the state. In the opinion of Craven, Hilliard had "crowded Yancey into silence."[53]

What were the factors responsible for Hilliard's decisive victory over the leading orator of Southern rights? First it should be noted that at the time of the congressional campaign of the summer of 1851, some of the Southern states had already taken action against immediate secession. Particularly was this true in Georgia where the conservative group, led by Toombs and Stephens, secured the passage of the "Georgia Platform" in December, 1850. Accepting the compromise as a final settlement of the slavery question, the framers of the "Georgia Platform" dealt the secession movement in the South a severe blow. In all Southern states where Unionist parties were formed—Georgia, Mississippi, and Alabama—the Unionists won the elections. Equally important, they persuaded "the

[49] Smith, *Reminiscences of a Long Life*, p. 223.

[50] Eufaula *Democrat*, May 15, 1849.

[51] See Montgomery *Advertiser*, November 15, 1885, and December 25, 1892; William Garrott Brown, *The Lower South in American History* (New York, 1902), p. 236; George F. Mellen, "Henry W. Hilliard and William L. Yancey," *Sewanee Review*, XVII (1909), pp. 32-50.

[52] DuBose, *Life of Yancey*, p. 187.

[53] Avery Craven, *The Repressible Conflict, 1830-1861* (Baton Rouge, 1939), p. 3.

body politic of South Carolina to relinquish for the time being its determination to secede."[54] Apparently the majority of the people of the South in 1851 still hopefully looked to the Union for the protection of their property rights.

That the Unionist sentiment which existed in Alabama was sufficient to produce a Hilliard victory there can be little doubt. But this fact alone does not explain fully the decisive margin by which Yancey was defeated. In accounting for that margin due weight must also be given to Yancey's vote on the Oregon question and to Hilliard's ability to exploit that vote. In every debate Hilliard, with pleasantry and satire, pointed up Yancey's vote. As he did so "astonishment and consternation sat on the countenances of the assembly."[55] More important, Yancey chafed under the attack. His "face reddened," observed one eyewitness, "and he moved uneasily in his chair. When he arose to reply, from overwrought feeling, he failed to do himself justice."[56] Pleased with Yancey's obvious discomfiture and the audience's surprised reaction, Hilliard persisted in pressing his advantage. On one occasion when he and Yancey were seated on the platform engaging in pleasant conversation, Yancey turned to him and said: "Shall we have a friendly debate today?" Hilliard replied: "Mr. Yancey, I must mention your vote on the Oregon question; I cannot overlook it today."[57] Although the actual effect of these references to the vote cannot be fully ascertained, it seems clear that they did what Hilliard hoped they would do. First, they tended to rattle Yancey and thereby reduce the power of his eloquence. Secondly, they made him appear inconsistent in the eyes of many of his listeners. Thus we may conclude that strong Unionist sentiment plus the Oregon vote contributed significantly to the most important victory of Hilliard's career.

Hilliard and Yancey met often during the next ten years, and in the end with different results. But it was the contest of 1851 which captured the fancy of the voters of the South. As they witnessed the debates they saw two of their greatest orators discuss one of the most crucial questions in American history. And, although they could not realize it at the time, they saw a symbolic prelude to the Civil War.

[54] Urich B. Phillips, "The Southern Whigs, 1834-1854," in *Turner Essays in American History* (New York, 1910), pp. 225-226.

[55] Montgomery *Alabama Journal*, July 19, 1851.

[56] Montgomery *Advertiser*, December 25, 1892.

[57] Hilliard, *Politics and Pen Pictures*, p. 254.

THE ORATOR

> The orator distrusts at first the fitness of his frank confessions, his want of knowledge of the persons he addresses, until he finds that he is the complement of his hearers; that they drink his words because he fulfils for them their own nature; the deeper he dives into his privatest, secretest presentiment, to his wonder he finds this is the most acceptable, most public, and universally true. The people delight in it; the better part of every man feels, This is my music; this is myself.
>
> Ralph Waldo Emerson, *The American Scholar.*

EMOTIONALISM IN ACTING

Garff B. Wilson

I

THE problem of emotion in acting has been discussed by performers and critics from Plato to José Ferrer. The subject is of vital importance to the player, who must decide whether he should actually feel emotion—and to what degree—and in what way he can summon it, and to the director and teacher who must counsel their players and must shape all the emotional elements of a production into an artistic entity. In this paper I shall not deal with the many complex problems involved in the general subject of emotion in acting, but only with one aspect of it, namely, *emotionalism* in acting. Recently I have been studying the achievements and methods of the leading actresses of the American stage, and I have been struck by the careers of a particular group of women who seem to constitute a recognizable school. Their methods and careers not only illustrate but illuminate the problem of emotionalism, and also reveal the limitations and hazards of acting based on emotionalism. The five actresses who constitute this school are: Anna Cora Mowatt, Laura Keene, Matilda Heron, Clara Morris, and Mrs. Leslie Carter—and their overlapping careers cover the period from 1845, when Mrs. Mowatt made her stage debut, until 1929, when Mrs. Carter played her final role. This period embraces a long and significant segment of the history of the American stage, and these actresses are among the most successful and influential of their day. I therefore feel that the emotionalism on which their acting was based and which was both good fortune and nemesis to their careers is worthy of study and evaluation.[1]

Garff B. Wilson (Ph.D., Cornell, 1940) is Associate Professor of Speech at the University of California at Berkeley, and is a previous contributor to the QJS.

II

What is meant by emotionalism in acting? As a manner of performing, it can be recognized by three characteristics. First of all, the emotionalistic actress actually experiences the feelings and passions of her role and surrenders herself to them. Secondly, the emotionalistic actress cultivates a lush, overt display of the passions she is feeling; her performance is marked by sobs, tears, screams, shudders, heavings, writhings, pantings, growlings, tremblings — and all manner of realistic physical manifestations. Thirdly, in surrendering to emotion and permitting its lush, overt expression, the emotionalistic actress eschews the discipline of control and technique; her elocution, gesture, movement, and performance of stage business are likely to be impromptu, unstudied, and haphazard. To clarify these characteristics, which, I believe, identify the emotionalistic actress, let me compare them to the methods of the performer whom, for want of a better term, I shall call the disciplined player.

Every actor and director will recognize that emotion is an indispensable

[1] In this paper no mention will be made of male performers as examples of emotionalism in acting, because the roles which men are asked to play and the traditions of manly behavior have not given rise to the kind of emotionalism discussed here. The emotion or emotionalism found in the acting of men will be the subject of a later paper.

ingredient of acting, and almost all players and directors will affirm that every actor worth his make-up feels the emotions of his role to some degree. Actors differ greatly in the amount of feeling they experience and in the length of time it takes them to summon this feeling, but very few will affirm, as Raymond Massey does, that "Personally, I have not 'felt the part' before an audience in twenty years."[2] The disciplined actor certainly feels his role to a greater or lesser degree, but this is quite different from surrendering oneself to the emotions of the part, which is the practice of the emotionalistic performer.

The second characteristic of the emotionalistic player—a lush display of physical actions and manifestations—is also akin to the practice of the disciplined player. In any performance, the emotions of a role must be communicated by voice, gesture, movement, and facial expression. But the disciplined player selects those details which best suggest the emotions of the situation, and suppresses others. Only the most significant physical manifestations are projected, and these in a conscious pattern, for, as George Henry Lewes has written, "the internal workings must be legible in the external symbols; and these external symbols must also have a certain grace and proportion to affect us aesthetically."[3] The emotionalistic player, in contrast, exercises little selectivity but includes in his performance the maximum number of "external symbols."

The third characteristic of the emotionalistic player—neglect of technique—is a matter of degree, for no actor performs without some technique. But, whereas the disciplined player uses it as a means of refining and controlling his emotional output, the emotionalistic player considers it of minor importance and relies, instead, on raw feeling to gain his effects.

It is apparent that this very description of emotionalism in acting is a condemnation of the term. Emotionalism thus defined would find few exponents or defenders at any time in the history of acting, and certainly no one would defend it today. Yet the description I have given is not arbitrary or imaginary or distorted; it is an inductive description derived from a study of the careers of the five American actresses under consideration here. A brief review of their careers will demonstrate that the characteristics I have listed are, indeed, the distinguishing traits of a popular school of American acting; such a review will also reveal the advantages to be gained from emotionalistic acting—as well as the limitations which seem to be inherent in it.

III

The acting career of Mrs. Anna Cora Mowatt is significant because it marks the beginning in the American theatre of the school of emotionalism. Mrs. Mowatt was an unusual and remarkable woman. At the age of twenty-five, after a career which had included the writing of her famous comedy *Fashion*, she decided to become an actress in order to contribute to her husband's financial recovery. Her only previous stage experience had been in home theatricals and as a public reader; yet after three weeks of study and one rehearsal, she made a triumphal debut at the Park Theatre, New York, as Pauline in *The Lady of Lyons*. This event occurred on June 13, 1845. Her acting

[2] Raymond Massey, "Acting," *The Theatre Handbook and Digest of Plays*, ed. Bernard Sobel (New York, 1940), p. 26.

[3] George Henry Lewes, *On Actors and the Art of Acting* (New York, 1878), p. 91.

career, once started, prospered enormously. During her first year on the stage she appeared in all the principal cities of the United States, acting for more than 200 nights in such roles as Lady Teazle, Mrs. Haller, Lucy Ashton, Katherine, Julia, and Juliet. For nine years Mrs. Mowatt performed successfully and prosperously in Great Britain and the United States. Then, in June, 1854, she suddenly withdrew from public life and never appeared on the stage again. What was the secret of her success?

There is no question but that she was a remarkably gifted person. She had unusual intelligence, keen aesthetic perception, thorough education, wide cultural experience, an excellent speaking voice, and beauty of face and figure—all of which are invaluable endowments for any actress. But, in addition, she had an emotional sensitivity which enabled her to "abandon herself to a role," to "live the part," and this ability, added to her grace of person, was sufficient to win her success on the stage despite her lack of training and apprenticeship.

Edgar Allan Poe, who was a warm admirer of Mrs. Mowatt's acting, singled out what he termed her "well-controlled impulsiveness" as the key to her effectiveness. Poe notes that she was able to make her bosom heave, her cheek grow pale, her limbs tremble, and her eyes fill with "nature's own tears" whenever she was called upon to do so, and that these gifts enabled her "effectively and unimpededly" to "lay bare to the audience the movements of her own passionate heart."[4]

Many other critics agree with Poe that Mrs. Mowatt's convincing emotional displays were the chief appeal of her acting. She herself tells us that she was an impulsive actress who could not arouse an audience unless she were deeply stirred. Describing her first appearance on the stage, she writes: "I gave myself up to the part, and acted with all the *abandon* and intensity of which I was capable."[5] Furthermore, in discussing various types of acting, she identified herself with the kind of actor who "totally loses his own individuality, and abandons himself to all the absorbing emotions that belong to the character he interprets;"[6] and she states further, "Yet I agree with those who maintain that the highest school of art is that in which the actor, Prospero-like, rises or stills tempestuous waves by the magical force of his will—produces and controls, *without sharing*, the emotions of the audience."[7]

Despite the success and acclaim which she achieved, it is unlikely that she ever mastered the subtle physical and vocal skills of the seasoned professional, or the technical facility to appear convincing when her own inspiration was at low ebb. Joseph Jefferson, always a perceptive critic, makes the following comment on her style: "I am of the opinion that 'once an amateur, always an amateur.' There are many good actors that have this peculiar, raw quality who have been on the stage for years; and it is because they began their careers by acting leading characters. Mrs. Mowatt and James H. Hackett were examples of many in our profession who have committed this fatal error. No matter how bold and dashing they may appear, there is a shyness and uncertainty about everything they do."[8]

[4] From *The Broadway Journal*, July 26, 1845, reproduced in *The Complete Works of Edgar Allan Poe*, Virginia Edition (New York, 1902), XII, 191.

[5] Anna Cora Mowatt, *Autobiography of an Actress* (Boston, 1845), p. 221.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 241.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 244.

[8] Joseph Jefferson, *Autobiography* (New York, 1889), p. 138.

The second prominent actress of the school of emotionalism, who made her New York debut just two years before Mrs. Mowatt quit the stage, was the imperious beauty, Laura Keene. Her acting furnishes another interesting example of feminine charm and emotionalism and, incidentally, her name is forever linked with American history because she was the star of the play being presented in Ford's Theatre on the night Abraham Lincoln was assassinated, and she was the one who recognized John Wilkes Booth as he made his escape and who held the dying President's head in her lap until he was carried from the theatre.

Laura Keene was English born and received her early theatrical training in Madame Vestris's London company. She came to the United States in 1852 to accept the position of leading lady in James W. Wallack's theatre, and henceforth her theatrical career was exclusively American.

After one highly successful season at Wallack's Theatre, Miss Keene departed abruptly and spent the next two years acting in Baltimore, San Francisco, and Australia. She returned to New York in 1855, and for the next eight years was manager and leading lady of her own playhouse. In 1863, tiring of her managerial chores, she relinquished her theatre and became a traveling star. But her career began to fade and her health began to fail. After several years of declining fortune, she died at the early age of fifty years,[9] leaving the memory of talents which never fully matured, but also leaving a record of activity, energy, and versatility which made her, for a time, an outstanding woman of the theatre.

The years from 1855 to 1863 were the most successful in the career of Laura Keene. As manager of her own theatre—and she was a dictatorial one—she designed and painted scenery, made costumes, trained actors, directed publicity, wrote and adapted scripts, and tried to encourage native Americans to write for the stage. She also, of course, played all the leading feminine roles in her productions—and for many years her acting ability was much admired. She had a beautiful face, a graceful figure, a musical voice, and an abundance of personal charm; and these endowments served her well in many roles. Early in her career she was praised for her versatility, and for a time she did essay a variety of parts, including roles in Shakespearean drama and "old" comedy. Presently, however, she began specializing in plays where personal charm and emotional display were the primary attractions. The character of these plays is indicated by their titles. *Mary's Birthday, Two Loves and a Life, Birds of Prey, The Wife's Secret, Plot and Passion, Rachel the Reaper, Camille,* and *Judith of Geneva*—these are only a few samples of the kind of dramas in which Miss Keene was the star. William Winter described such plays as "ultraemotional drama of the hydrostatic order"[10] and deplored the fact that Miss Keene blighted her talents by identifying herself with them. There is no record of how fully she felt the passions she portrayed or how extravagantly she may have embroidered the emotional fabric of her roles. It is clear, however, that her feminine charm and emotionalism were primary attractions in her acting. It is also clear that after a brilliant beginning as a versatile actress she limited her talents largely to

[9] According to her daughter. See John Creahan, *Life of Laura Keene* (Philadelphia, 1897), p. 15.

[10] William Winter, *Vagrant Memories* (New York, 1915), p. 57.

emotional and sentimental histrionics and subsequently lost her hold on the public. As William Winter said in 1915, "it is scarcely possible, even at this long distance from the time of her feverish exploits and melancholy end, to think of her without a certain sense of regretful disappointment."[11]

Matilda Heron, whose career covered almost exactly the same years as the career of Laura Keene, is the third member of the school of emotionalism. She is an influential member, too, even though her contribution to American acting is represented in a single outstanding role: Camille. This is the role which brought her fame and fortune; in this role she most effectively displayed her naturalistic, emotionalistic style of acting; and this is the role which influenced many other players to join the school of emotionalism.

Matilda Heron, Irish by birth but American by adoption, had made a successful debut in Philadelphia early in 1851 and in the three succeeding years had played such roles as Juliet, Parthenia, and Mrs. Haller. Then, in 1854, she went to Paris and saw Mme. Doche act in Dumas's *La Dame aux Camélias*. The American actress was fascinated. She returned to the play night after night and memorized every detail of the production. She bought a copy of the play and made her own translation. By the time she returned to the United States she was ready to act the Matilda Heron version of *Camille*. This she did in New Orleans in 1855, but the results were unsensational. It was not until two years later, when she staged her production at Wallack's Theatre in New York, that the furor began. She and *Camille* became the rage. Her picture appeared in all the journals; she was pursued, serenaded, lionized. Poems were dedicated to her, and music was written in her honor. Her *Camille* ran for one hundred nights at Wallack's and was repeated with phenomenal success all over the United States. Before she sank into obscurity, the play netted her at least $100,000.

Matilda Heron was not the first Camille America had seen, but she was by far the most sensational. She stunned her audiences with the emotionalism and the naturalism of her portrayal. The play she had adapted from Dumas afforded her wide scope for the display of both these qualities. Her *Camille* was written in a far more realistic style than the standard drama of the period. It did not deal with courtly nor poetical figures but with more familiar human beings. The passions exhibited were not noble or exalted; they were the visceral emotions of sexual love and physical suffering. In order to portray such emotions in such a play, Miss Heron developed a style of acting which was not only emotionalistic but disturbingly naturalistic. Her naturalism was not the photographic realism developed by David Belasco in the twentieth century, but had several characteristics new enough in the mid-nineteenth century to cause excited comment. For example, Miss Heron did not make her entrance with her face to the galleries and wait for a "reception"; she walked in naturally and ignored the audience. She did not raise her voice or project her words perceptibly, but spoke in what seemed to be a commonplace, conversational tone. On occasions she even dared to turn her back to the audience. Another aspect of her naturalism was her inclusion of a multitude of realistic details. She made no attempt to idealize or refine her character; she did not even select and arrange her effects but included commonplace busi-

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 59.

ness of every sort, no matter how awkward or distracting it appeared. And, finally, she portrayed physical and clinical reactions which were rarely if ever exhibited on the stage of that period. Many of her scenes were called repulsive or revolting. Her deathbed scene was considered especially painful. But all the "disgusting minutiae" added to the fascination of the play and attracted thousands of spectators.

Miss Heron's emotionalism was another quality which amazed the public. She was impulsive and sentimental by nature, given to such foibles as writing on the wall of her St. Louis hotel room in immense crayon letters: "Easter Sunday. God bless St. Louis! Matilda Heron."[12] On the stage she had an animal vitality and a wildness of passion which she displayed lushly and extravagantly. She did not practice repression but let her emotions flood over in fascinating display. She knew all the passions and agonies of a woman's heart, and projected them with vivid reality. Mrs. Mowatt and Laura Keene utilized the power of emotionalistic display, but theirs was an emotionalism somewhat idealized by an earlier convention and by the poetic parts which they often played. The emotionalism of Matilda Heron and her imitators was the realistic passion of the boudoir and the sick-room, unrefined by poetry or idealism.

Although she exhibited little imagination or intellect, Miss Heron's stage personality had a magnetism which could hypnotize an audience. As long as her spell was potent she retained a hold on the public, but when her power waned she apparently did not have sufficient art to sustain her, and so sank rapidly into disfavor and obscurity. She will be remembered not only because of the sensational success of her *Camille,* but because she opened the eyes of many an actress to the fascination which can be exercised by undiluted emotionalism, and because she developed a style which combined emotionalism with naturalism and thus established a trend which influenced American actresses for many years to come.

Clara Morris, the fourth actress of the emotionalistic school, was the most successful of them all. Whereas Matilda Heron triumphed in only one role, Clara Morris succeeded in a multitude of parts for a great number of years and far outdid her predecessors, as well as her successors, in the lushness and naturalism of her emotional pyrotechnics.

Miss Morris, who had served an apprenticeship of seven years in the theatres of Cleveland and Cincinnati, launched her career as an emotional actress in September, 1870, in Augustin Daly's New York production of a play called *Man and Wife.* Agnes Ethel, the leading lady of the company, had refused the feminine lead and so the part was entrusted to Clara Morris, whom Daly had recently hired to play comedy roles. Clara Morris never played comedy because her success in *Man and Wife* was so great that she immediately became a specialist in domestic emotionalism. She abandoned parts in other types of performance and concentrated on playing the tearful heroines of modern French melodramas such as *L'Article 47, Alixe,* and *Miss Multon.* She played so many of these roles, and she identified herself so completely with them, that when, later on, she tried to extend her range and act Lady Macbeth or Jane Shore, she was criticized for con-

[12] Catherine Mary Reignolds-Winslow, *Yesterday with Actors* (Boston, 1887), p. 110.

verting these heroines into "incongruous women of the present day."[13]

In the parts she acted in domestic melodrama, Miss Morris won the title of "Queen of Spasms." She was always the "soiled dove," the woman who dies a heart-rending death after several acts of sinning and suffering. She was unmatched in her ability to portray the inner struggles which manifest themselves in the quivering lip, the heaving breast, and especially the streaming eye. Her power to manufacture stage tears was phenomenal. She could weep any time the dramatic situation demanded it. The tears were real, too, not simulated by trickery or illusion. They flowed whenever she turned her thoughts to sad or pitiable things. She tells us that it was necessary for her to feel actual sadness before she could weep, but apparently she was able to summon the right mood simply by recalling a tragic book, poem, or incident from real life.

Like Matilda Heron, Clara Morris also practiced a naturalistic type of acting. Her scar in *L'Article 47* was copied from a hideous disfigurement she saw on a woman who sat opposite her in a street car. Her simulation of death by heart disease in *Miss Multon* was copied from the actual horrors she observed when a physician friend of hers paid a sick patient to run up a long flight of stairs so that the actress could see the actual symptoms of angina pectoris. Incidentally, Miss Morris reproduced these symptoms so realistically in her performance that she alarmed several medical men who sat in the audience.

She rendered other death scenes with equal realism. Her acting in *Camille* was criticized for including too much revolting detail. The poisoning scene in *The Sphinx*, another play adapted from the French, was described by a contemporary critic as follows: ". . . anything more ghastly, terrible, and realistic than her death scene has not for a long time been seen on the stage. . . . A visible shudder went through the audience, and horror was depicted upon every face. Mingled with this was a sensation of disgust."[14]

Clara Morris's unique power to fascinate the spectator with her exhibitions of emotion was her supreme dramatic gift, and it covered a multitude of deficiencies. She did not have a particularly beautiful face or graceful figure. In her middle years she was sometimes described as being stout and ugly. Her voice was ordinary, and her elocution faulty. She was frequently criticized for her nasal twang and her barbarous pronunciations. She was crude in other aspects of her stage technique, too. Her gestures were monotonous, her movements were often careless and awkward, and she had many irritating mannerisms. And yet she triumphed. In spite of all her sins and deficiencies, in spite of the melodramatic claptrap of her plays, she mesmerized both the public and the critics and won herself a large and devoted following.

During the early years of her career, Miss Morris enjoyed an immense popu-

[13] Clinton Stuart, "Miss Clara Morris," *Actors and Actresses of Great Britain and the United States, The Present Time*, ed. Brander Matthews and Laurence Hutton (New York, 1886), p. 225.

[14] From an unidentified review in the Robinson Locke Collection, Scrapbook 351, New York Public Library, concerning the premier of Octave Feuillet's *The Sphinx*, produced at the Union Square Theatre, September 21, 1874. This same scene was described in less complimentary fashion by the critic of the *New York Mail* who wrote, on September 22, 1874: ". . . the last convulsions of death are simulated on the stage. Miss Morris chews soap, turns the whites of her eyes up and the corners of her mouth down, smears white powder and red paint over her cheeks and chin, angles her wrists and stiffens her back. Such is the pleasing spectacle presented to a horrified audience as the final tableau of this moral drama. . . ."

larity. Audiences had never seen anything like her opulent display of womanly emotions. Her ability to weep was the talk of the nation. So long as her inspiration was strong and her emotions youthful and vigorous, she maintained a loyal following. As she grew older and stouter and failed to develop in versatility or artistry, and as popular taste shifted from the Sardou-type of drama to the Ibsenite play, the critics began to ridicule her methods. In the 1890's, ill health and waning popularity forced her to retire from regular stage appearances. For several years thereafter, she was seen occasionally in vaudeville and revivals, and kept very much in the public eye by her lecture tours and her writing, but she never regained the popularity or esteem she had once enjoyed as queen of the school of emotionalism.

Mrs. Leslie Carter, the fifth member of this school, can be considered its last outstanding exponent. She triumphed in emotionalistic acting before the demands of the Ibsen-Chekhov drama rendered it unacceptable and, although she eventually changed her style to fit a new kind of drama and a changed public taste, she is best remembered as a successor to the traditions of Mowatt, Keene, Heron, and Morris.

Mrs. Carter determined to become an actress after a divorce from her wealthy husband left her without a means of support. Since she had no experience or training, her only assets were the notoriety received from her divorce suit, her determination, and her beauty of face and voice. With these qualifications she won appearances in two Broadway productions—*The Ugly Duckling* in 1890 and *Miss Helyett* in 1891—but failed to achieve any particular distinction. She then retired for two years to pursue a strenuous course of training under David Belasco, emerging in 1895 to act the leading role in Belasco's production of *The Heart of Maryland*. She was sensationally successful, and played the role for three years. Then followed her triumphs in Belasco's *Zaza*, *Du Barry*, and *Adrea*.

In 1906, she defied the wishes of her tutor and manager, Belasco, and married an obscure actor named William L. Payne. There ensued a much publicized break with Belasco; she never acted for him again. Her career, however, continued for twenty-five years under other directors or under her own management. Although she flourished to a degree, her subsequent success was never so brilliant as it had been under Belasco. Her last stage appearances were in 1929, and she died eight years later.

The bases for Mrs. Carter's success as an actress are clear. She had striking beauty; a mass of red hair "one shade hotter than Titian," an exquisitely pale complexion, soft blue eyes, and a slender, shapely figure; she had a mellifluous, musical voice, and a fiery temperament to match her red hair; finally, she had the ability to lose herself in the emotions of her role and to involve an audience in the hysteria of her own feelings.

There is much evidence to illustrate the emotional nature of her acting. One scene in *The Heart of Maryland* required her to race up a flight of stairs and swing from the clapper of a bell to prevent its ringing. In rehearsal she tried running up the spiral stairs but found that the ascent made her dizzy. She refused to rehearse the scene, declaring that she could never do it except under the excitement of actual performance. This proved to be the case. Whenever there was an audience to stimulate her, she could perform her

gymnastics with admirable success, but without an audience she was unable to act.

The same situation prevailed in her performance of the sensational play *Zaza*. Her force and effectiveness, says Lewis Strang, came from a state of semi-hysteria. There was, he said, "an exciting spirit of gamble about Mrs. Carter's impersonation. One paid his money at the door, not knowing exactly what was coming to him in return for it. He might be favored with a wholly absorbing exhibition of hysterical theatrics; he might get merely a mildly interesting specimen of mechanical acting."[15]

On the opening night of *Zaza*, Mrs. Carter pulled all the emotional stops and gave a performance which stirred her audience with as much passion—almost—as she herself had been experiencing. Franklin E. Fyles describes this debauch in the following words: "Finally, the audience could no longer contain itself, and it burst into mad applause and cheers, drowning the last words of the hysterical woman before them. As she fell back against the mantelpiece exhausted and trembling, the tears streaming down her face, . . . all over the house people rose, some standing on their chairs, waving handkerchiefs and programmes in fanatical irresponsibility."[16] Mrs. Carter was called upon for a speech, but, reports the *New York Herald* for January 10, 1899, she was "too overwrought for more than a mere expression of thanks."

The same kind of emotional exhibitionism characterized her acting in other roles. Whenever she was able to throw herself into a state of semi-hysteria, she stirred and titillated her audiences; when the mood escaped her, she failed to make an impression. Thus it followed that her early performances in any role were generally her best; the longer she played a part the more mechanical it became because, with each repetition, she was less able to lose herself in the appropriate emotions.

William Winter despised the "lewdness and cheapness" of Mrs. Carter's roles, and he ridiculed her reliance on physical and emotional exhibitionism. In commenting on her performance in *Du Barry*, Winter says: ". . . the method of Mrs. Carter . . . was to work herself into a state of violent excitement, to weep, vociferate, shriek, rant, become hoarse with passion, and finally to flop and beat the floor."[17] Although Winter disliked such a method, he nevertheless recognized the "executive force and skill" in her performances, and when she acted the role of Adrea in 1904, Winter had high praise for "the depth of tragical feeling" and the "power of dramatic expression"[18] which she revealed—to Winter—for the first time.

In her later years on the stage, after she broke with Belasco and after her youth and emotional powers had declined, Mrs. Carter changed her style to fit her roles in such plays as Pinero's *The Gay Lord Quex* and Maugham's *The Circle*. However, it is as a successful emotionalistic actress in such plays as *Zaza* and *Du Barry* that she earned her place as a successor to the tradition of Anna Cora Mowatt, Laura Keene, Matilda Heron, and Clara Morris.

IV

The careers of the five women I have discussed are revealing and informative. They disclose the existence on the

[15] Lewis Strang, *Famous Actresses of the Day in America*, Second Series (Boston, 1902), p. 201.

[16] Franklin E. Fyles, "Mrs. Leslie Carter—A Study," *Leslie's Magazine*, LIII (April 1902), 658.

[17] William Winter, *The Wallet of Time* (New York, 1913), II, 327.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 332.

American stage of a school of acting which won popularity and acclaim for its exponents, which exerted considerable influence for a long period of time, and which, to some degree, still exerts an influence. More than this, the striking similarities in the careers of these five actresses suggest certain conclusions about emotionalism in acting which are worthy of mention.

One such conclusion is that emotionalistic acting can flourish only in plays of a certain type. Matilda Heron triumphed in *Camille;* Clara Morris in domestic melodrama adapted from the French; Mrs. Carter in *Zaza* and *Du Barry;* and before them, Mrs. Mowatt in such tearful roles as Pauline in *The Lady of Lyons,* Mrs. Haller in *The Stranger,* and Julia in *The Hunchback,* roles which also served Laura Keene. If one examines these plays, he will find that all of them are characterized by lush sentiment, melodramatic action, and contrived emotional crises. The characterizations appear false, the emotions artificial and overstrained. Such plays, apparently, lend themselves to an emotionalistic treatment which is intolerable in the performance of Shakespeare, Ibsen, or Chekhov. Thus it appears that emotionalistic acting can flourish only in periods when the public taste will accept emotionalistic plays.

Another conclusion suggested by the careers of the five queens of emotionalism is that youth, beauty, and personal magnetism are essential in successful emotionalistic acting. Youth is necessary to insure the actress an abundance of fresh and vigorous emotion because, with advancing years, the wellsprings of passion appear to dry up. Beauty and personal magnetism are needed to charm the eye and sway the heart of the spectator so that he suspends his critical faculties while he revels in the personal spell of the player. It is true, of course, that these qualities are helpful in every kind of acting—that the stage always has a place for them. But those performers whom we call great do not rely on these qualities alone, but develop powers which serve them well into old age and win them plaudits long after they have passed their physical prime. Mary Ann Duff, Charlotte Cushman, Helena Modjeska, and Fanny Janauscheck are outstanding examples of actresses in the American theatre who succeeded greatly long after their youth was gone. On the other hand, the emotionalistic actresses I have reviewed lost their appeal when they lost their youth and subsequently sank into obscurity. This was the fate of Laura Keene, Matilda Heron, and Clara Morris, and, to a lesser degree, of Mrs. Carter. Mrs. Mowatt, the first member of the dynasty, saved herself from failure of this kind by quitting the stage before the decline could set in.

The final conclusion to be drawn from the careers of these five emotionalistic actresses is almost trite and moralistic. It is that the art of acting requires training and experience; that it utilizes youth and beauty and personal magnetism but, as an art, requires far more than these; that emotional exhibitionism is a fatal substitute for art because its appeal, though great at times, is false and transient; and that the mysterious skills and powers which the true artist acquires after years of blood, toil, sweat, and tears are the secrets, in the long run, of enduring success in acting.

LORD BROUGHAM'S AUTHORSHIP OF RHETORICAL ARTICLES IN THE *EDINBURGH REVIEW*

Lloyd I. Watkins

I

THE *Edinburgh Review's* policy of allowing its contributors to remain cloaked in anonymity has provided an interesting problem of scholarship for many students. Lord Brougham has long been considered one of the heaviest contributors to the *Review*. While he is remembered today as one of Britain's outstanding orators, politicians, and jurists of the nineteenth century, his writings have been largely forgotten. However, he wrote voluminously on many subjects, and one of his favorite topics was oratory. It is safe to say that no orator since Cicero has discoursed so freely and intelligently upon his art. Although the *Historical Sketches of Statesmen of the Time of George III* is Brougham's major contribution to rhetorical theory and criticism, several articles in the *Review* purportedly came from his pen and are of considerable importance.

In his *Contributions to the Edinburgh Review,* Brougham claimed five articles bearing on the subject of rhetoric: "English Orators—Lord Erskine" (April 1810); "English Orators—Lord Erskine" (February 1812); "Roman Orators—Cicero" (October 1813); "Greek Orators—Demosthenes" (October 1821); and "Pulpit Eloquence" (December 1826).[1] Doubts concerning the validity of his claim to these articles were raised by Aspinall, who wrote in his biography of Brougham in 1927:

> I am indebted to Mr. Harold Cox, the present editor of the *Edinburgh Review,* and to Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co., for an authentic list of the articles which Brougham contributed to that periodical from its foundation in 1802 to 1830. . . . Brougham claimed a great number of articles which were really not his own; on the other hand, he wrote several to which he laid no claim.[2]

Aspinall then presented a list of Brougham's articles which did not coincide entirely with those claimed by Brougham in his *Contributions.*[3] While not mentioning two of the articles which Brougham claimed, the Aspinall list attributed to him two articles, "Demosthenes" (January 1820), and "Demosthenes" (February 1822), which Brougham did not claim. This discrepancy moved me to make an investigation of the seven articles in question.

My investigation made use of two types of evidence: external evidence from printed and personal sources; and internal evidence obtained from a comparison of the disputed articles with

Lloyd Irion Watkins (Ph.D., Wisconsin, 1954) is Assistant Professor of Speech and Communications at Moorhead State Teachers College, Moorhead, Minnesota.

[1] Henry Lord Brougham, *Contributions to the Edinburgh Review* (London and Glasgow: R. Griffin and Co., 1856). The articles on rhetoric included in this work were checked by me with the original articles in the *Edinburgh Review* and found to be identical with the exception of certain legal technicalities completely irrelevant to this study. Thus for convenience the articles in the *Contributions* were the ones used for analysis in this article wherever possible.

[2] Arthur Aspinall, *Lord Brougham and the Whig Party* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1939), p. 256.

[3] This list appears on pp. 256-261 of the work just cited and will hereafter be referred to as the Aspinall list.

works definitely known to be Brougham's.

To prevent confusion and to make later reference easier, I think it wise to explain further the types of external evidence which I used. The most readily available evidence is that of published lists purporting to identify the contributions of a certain author, or to identify the authors of all the articles, in early numbers of the *Review*. The first list I used is that compiled by Brougham himself in his *Contributions*. Of course, this is not a list in the ordinary sense of the word, but rather a collection of the articles which Brougham claimed he wrote for the *Review*. The second list I used is the Aspinall list, which purports to be an authentic account of Brougham's contributions to the *Review*. Another list which I used was published by Professors Schneider, Griggs, and Kern of Temple University.[4] This list has an interesting origin. It was taken from handwritten attributions of authorship made by Anthony Trollope in a set of the *Edinburgh Review* now in the possession of the Sullivan Memorial Library, Temple University; but unfortunately it ends with the 1812 numbers. I also made use of the list compiled by W. A. Copinger, in which he attempted to name the authors of all the articles in the first hundred numbers of the *Review*,[5] but apparently found the task too great, and left many of the authors unidentified. I also consulted three lists which are concerned with the contributions of other writers, and which add important negative evidence concerning Brougham's authorship of the rhetorical articles: Cockburn's published list of Francis Jeffrey's contributions;[6] Smith's identical list;[7] and Lady Holland's list of Sydney Smith's contributions.[8] The final list from which I obtained information is a privately owned list made up by Lord Cockburn and dated 1849.

In addition to these lists, I used two other types of external evidence: correspondence between me and authorities on the *Edinburgh Review*, officers of libraries, and private research workers—which with one exception brought to light no new information; and comments bearing on the authorship of the articles found in several widely scattered volumes.

With these types of evidence in mind, we can now approach the question of authorship of the seven articles. Those which are almost certainly from Brougham's pen will be considered first, and those of more doubtful authenticity will then receive treatment.

II

My investigations of "English Orators—Lord Erskine" (April 1810) and "English Orators—Lord Erskine" (February 1812) can easily be summarized together. The external evidence concerning these two articles is identical. Both were claimed by Brougham in his *Contributions*. The Aspinall list, the Schneider-Griggs-Kern list, the Copinger list, and the unpublished Cockburn list all attribute them to Brougham. Cockburn's and Smith's lists and Lady Holland's list make no mention of either article. No other evidence could be found to contradict these attributions.

[4] Elisabeth Schneider, Irwin Griggs, and John D. Kern, "Brougham's Early Contributions to the *Edinburgh Review*: A New List," *Modern Philology*, XLII (February 1945), 152-178.

[5] W. A. Copinger, *On the Authorship of the First Hundred Numbers of the Edinburgh Review* (Manchester: Priory Press, 1895).

[6] Henry Lord Cockburn, *Life of Lord Jeffrey* (Edinburgh: Adam and Chas. Black, 1852), I, 419-425.

[7] D. Nichol Smith, *Jeffrey's Literary Criticism* (London: Henry Frowde, 1910), pp. 210-216.

[8] Lady Holland, *A Memoir of the Reverend Sydney Smith* (London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1885), I, 426.

The internal evidence appears just as convincing in favor of Brougham's authorship. I compared the *Review* articles with the sketch of Erskine which Brougham wrote in *Statesmen of the Time of George III*. This sketch reveals that Brougham was Erskine's intense admirer. It also exhibits an intimate knowledge of Erskine as a man and an orator. Both of these qualities are present in the articles on Erskine in the *Review*—great admiration for the man coupled with considerable knowledge about him. Indeed, it appears unlikely that Brougham, a person of considerable power in the ranks of the contributors to the *Review* in 1810, would have allowed a subject so dear to his heart to be usurped by another.

Brougham is quite concerned with Erskine's character in his sketch in the *Statesmen*. He wrote:

> He was an undaunted man; he was an undaunted advocate. To no Court did he ever truckle, neither to the Court of the King, nor to the Court of the King's judges. Their smiles and their frowns he disregarded alike in the fearless discharge of his duty. . . . In 1794, his dauntless energy, kindling his eloquence, inspiring his conduct, giving direction and lending firmness to his matchless skill, resisted the combination of statesmen, and princes, and lawyers—the league of cruelty and craft, formed to destroy our liberties—and triumphantly scattered to the winds the half-accomplished scheme of an unsparing proscription.[9]

In the 1810 article on Erskine in the *Review*, there is a very similar tribute to his character:

> The professional life of this eminent person, who has, of late years, reached the highest honours of the law, is in every respect useful as an example to future lawyers. It shows, that a base, time-serving demeanour towards the King, and a corrupt or servile conduct towards the Government, are not the only, though, from the frailty of human nature, and the wickedness of the age, they may prove the surest roads to preferment . . . it is doubly important, by proving how much a single man can do against the corruptions of his age, and how far he can vindicate the liberties of his country, so long as courts of justice are pure, by raising his single voice against the outcry of the people, and the influence of the Crown, at a time when a union of these opposite forces was bearing down all opposition in Parliament, and daily setting at nought the most splendid talents, armed with the most just cause.[10]

And the closing paragraph of the 1812 article on Erskine in the *Review* reveals the same trend of thought:

> In concluding these reflections, we cannot avoid recurring to the topic with which our former article on the same subject was closed. To hold up Lord Erskine's skill and eloquence to the younger members of the profession for their models might in most instances be unavailing. But every one, however slenderly gifted, may follow him close in the path of pure honour and unsullied integrity;—above all—of high and unbending independence—incapable of being seduced or awed, either by the political or judicial influence of the times. Had he not been the first in this path—had his powers been exerted in obsequiousness to the government, or in time-serving or timid submission to the course of justice—we, at least, should not have stept aside to attempt the task of praising his eloquence.[11]

In the sketch of Erskine in *Statesmen of the Time of George III*, Brougham made reference to the "entire devotion to his cause [which] made him reject everything which did not help it forward, and indignantly scorn all temptation to sacrifice its smallest point for any rhetorical triumph. . . ."[12] Throughout that sketch Brougham considers this functional approach—this "entire devotion to his cause"—as one of the leading criteria with which to measure the eloquence of a barrister. This same criterion is also found prominently in the two articles on Erskine in the *Review*. The first contains the following

[9] Brougham, *Historical Sketches of Statesmen of the Time of George III* (London and Glasgow: R. Griffin and Co., 1839), I, 242-243.

[10] Brougham, *Contributions*, I, 84-85.

[11] Brougham, *Contributions*, I, 99.

[12] Brougham, *Statesmen of the Time of George III*, I, 240.

criticism of Erskine's speech for Stockdale:

> . . . in no one sentence is the subject—the business in hand—the case—the client—the verdict, lost sight of; and the fire of that oratory . . . which was melting the hearts and dazzling the understanding of his hearers, had not the power to touch for an instant the hard head of the *Nisi Prius* lawyer, from which it radiated; or make him swerve, by one hair-breadth even, from the minuter details most befitting his purpose, and the alternate admissions and disavowals best suited to put his case in the safest position.[13]

In the criticism of a minor seduction case, the second article in the *Review* stresses the same point:

> It might be supposed that he is in reality going to lecture upon some general topic arising out of the cause; not for the sake of really . . . edifying his audience, but for relieving their attention, and displaying rhetoric.—No such thing—these are arts of lesser rhetoricians.—He enlarges on such points indeed, and persuades his hearers that he is instructing them, and stepping aside for their improvement; but after thus getting the more complete and unsuspecting possession of them, he speedily, but not abruptly, turns all he has been saying to the account of his cause, by a transition perfectly natural, and sufficiently indicating the purpose for which the supposed digression was indulged in.[14]

There can be little doubt that the two articles in the *Review* are themselves from the same pen. The critical methods used in each are too similar for it to be otherwise. Erskine's speeches are arranged in the order of their importance as judged by the author, and extensive quoting is used to illustrate their qualities. The order of importance of the speeches is determined in the same manner in each article—the first criterion being the long range effectiveness of the speeches, the second, the short range effectiveness. Thus these two articles in the *Review* are undoubtedly from the same author, who according to evidence, both external and internal, is Brougham.

[13] Brougham, *Contributions*, I, 74.
[14] Brougham, *Contributions*, I, 97.

III

The article entitled "Roman Orators—Cicero," which appeared in the *Review* in October, 1813, was claimed by Brougham in his *Contributions* and was attributed to him in the unpublished Cockburn list. In *The "Pope" of Holland House*, edited by Lady Seymour, there is a letter from John Whishaw to Smithson Tennant, dated November, 1813, which states in part: ". . . the new number of the *Edinburgh Review* (just published) contains two articles by Mackintosh, on Rogers and Madame de Stael. Three by Brougham—on Dumont, the Abuses of the Press, and a translation of Cicero."[15] In the *Opinions of Lord Brougham* an anonymous editor used the Cicero article to illustrate Brougham's opinions on rhetoric,[16] and Schneider has attributed this article to Brougham with the comment, "I regard the evidence as certain for this one."[17] In addition to these positive attributions, it is important to note that no evidence claiming the article for another could be found.

This article presents no internal evidence which is as definite a clue to its authorship as that found in the Erskine articles. There is one passage, however, which exhibits two Broughamian characteristics: a certain vagueness of criticism, and a functional approach to oratory. This passage is concerned with the speeches which Cicero wrote against Verres, particularly those parts dealing with the crucifixion of a Roman citizen:

> It is a storehouse from whence the finest examples of almost every kind of figure have

[15] Lady Seymour, ed. *The "Pope" of Holland House* (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1906), p. 42.
[16] *The Opinions of Lord Brougham* (London: Henry Colburn, 1837), pp. 428-447.
[17] Letter to me from Professor Schneider, March 18, 1954.

been drawn; and yet more wonderful than the boldness and propriety of these figures is the beautiful and judicious disposition of them. Nor is there a doubt that the admirable discretion of the passage crowns the whole, and exemplifies the orator's own rule, the golden canon of the art, that whatever does not promote the main object of the oration is to be rejected as a deformity, how fair soever it be to the eye. . . .[18]

Nothing in this article indicates that it is not by Brougham; no propositions are expressed which are inimical to his. Therefore, in view of the fact that all the positive and negative evidence favors Brougham's authorship, this article should be regarded as authentically his.

IV

In examining the external evidence for "The Greek Orators—Demosthenes," which appeared in the *Review* for October, 1821, we find that this article is claimed by Brougham in his *Contributions,* and is attributed to him by the Aspinall list. But Copinger's list credits it to Brougham and Sir John Williams. Brougham cast some doubt on his own claim to being author of this article when, in his *Statesmen of the Time of George III,* in his sketch of Williams, he wrote, "There are some very able papers of his in the *Edinburgh Review*, especially one on the Greek orators in 1821."[19] The only paper on Greek orators in the 1821 volume is the article on Demosthenes. Now, it is probable that Brougham made a mistake in the *Statesmen of the Time of George III.* He wrote that work in a hurry, and probably did not bother to check the exact dates of articles which he mentions. It is much more likely that he would have checked the date while working exclusively on his *Contributions,* and that he actually meant in *Statesmen of the Time of George III* to assign to Williams the 1820, not the 1821 article. In fact, he assigned the 1820 article to Williams in the *Contributions,* where he assigned the 1821 article to himself. There is no external evidence which assigns the 1821 article to anyone other than Brougham or Williams.

The internal evidence presents an almost irrefutable argument in favor of Brougham's authorship or coauthorship. The 1821 article on Demosthenes devotes a great deal of space to showing how carefully Demosthenes elaborated his orations. One of the chief evidences of this elaboration, says the article, is the recurrence of the same language in several of Demosthenes' speeches:

Having the same ideas to express, he did not, like our easy and fluent moderns, clothe them in different language, for the sake of variety; but reflecting that he had, upon the fullest deliberation, adopted one form of expression as the best, and because every other needs be worse, he used it again without change, unless further labour and more trials had enabled him in any particular to improve the workmanship.[20]

This concept appears in two works which definitely belong to Brougham. In his discourse upon being installed Rector of Glasgow University in 1825, he stated, ". . . in Demosthenes . . . we can trace, by the recurrence of the same passage, with progressive improvements in different speeches, how nicely he polished the more exquisite parts of his compositions."[21] Brougham's "Dissertation on the Eloquence of the Ancients," written in 1838, also utilizes in detail this theme from the 1821 Demosthenes article. Correspondence between the language of these two works makes it appear almost as if Brougham himself

[18] Brougham, *Contributions,* I, 15.

[19] Brougham, *Statesmen of the Time of George III* (Glasgow, 1856-1858), II, 321.

[20] Brougham, *Contributions,* I, 45.

[21] *Speeches of Henry Lord Brougham* (Edinburgh: Adam and Chas. Black; London: Longman, Orme, Brown, Green, and Longmans; Ridgway and Sons; Charles Knight and Co., 1838), III, 92.

were following the Demosthenean idea of allowing well-wrought passages to recur.

A few examples will further illustrate the point. In the 1821 *Review* article we find the following reference to the Fourth Philippic:

> Commentators and critics, who have never very nicely traced this subject, aware generally of the existence of these repetitions, have denominated that Philippic the peroration of the whole nine speeches against Philip; and thus conceived that they accounted for so many passages being found in it which had occurred in the others. But in truth the oration is almost entirely a repetition, and chiefly from one of the minor works, the oration upon the affairs of the Chersonese, sometimes called the Eighth Philippic.[22]

The "Dissertation" with reference to the same speech of Demosthenes states:

> The repetitions are no where to be found so frequent as in the Fourth Philippic, which for this reason has been termed by commentators and critics the Peroration of the Nine Orations against Philip. Not having, it should seem, considered this subject very attentively, or been aware that numerous repetitions are also to be found in the rest of the lesser orations, they seem to have thought that this notion of a peroration sufficiently explained the whole matter. But in truth the Fourth Philippic is almost entirely repetition, and chiefly from one of the preceding ones, perhaps the most magnificent of the minor works, that upon the Chersonese, sometimes called the Eighth Philippic.[23]

Not only are these ideas the same in the 1821 article and in the "Dissertation," but the language of the last sentences in each passage is almost identical.

Similarity of content and expression is also found with reference to other passages on ancient perorations. The 1821 article declares:

> The Perorations of the Greek orators are not remarkable for strength, if we regard only the very last sentences of all; because it seems to have been a rule enjoined by the severe taste of those times, that, after being wrought up to a great pitch of emotion, the speaker should, in quitting his audience, leave an impression of dignity, which cannot be maintained without composure.[24]

And in the "Dissertation" we find:

> It is worthy of remark, that the perorations, if by this we mean the very concluding sentences of all, in the Greek orations, are calm and tame, compared with the rest of their textures, and especially with their penultimate portions, which rise to the highest pitch of animation. There seems to have been a rule enjoined by the same severe taste which forbade any expression of passion in a statue, that the orator should close his speech in graceful repose.[25]

It is needless to continue the comparison of the 1821 article and the "Dissertation"; it is sufficient to remark that the latter appears to be principally an elaboration of the former. To be sure, material has been added to the latter, but many of the ideas, illustrations, and even words are the same in both. If Brougham is not the author, or co-author, of the 1821 article, he must be charged with baldest plagiarism. The only other person suspected of having any part in writing the article is Sir John Williams, and it is to him that Brougham dedicated his "Dissertation." It is almost inconceivable that he would have dedicated his work to the man, still alive at the time, whose ideas he had plagiarized. Even though several of the lists give Brougham at least partial credit for the 1821 article, the internal evidence seems so strong as almost alone to establish his claims to being sole author.

The 1821 Demosthenes article bears a resemblance, moreover, to the 1813 Cicero article, and thus it appears as if they must have come from the same pen. Both conclude in identically the same manner by giving a few notes on the pronunciation of ancient times—Roman in the case of the Cicero article,

[22] Brougham, *Contributions*, I, 30.
[23] Brougham, *Speeches*, IV, 388-389.
[24] Brougham, *Contributions*, I, 37.
[25] Brougham, *Speeches*, IV, 405.

Greek in the Demosthenes article. Brougham considered himself quite an authority on the ancient languages; so such a touch would not be unexpected from him.

V

The only external evidence which I could find to establish the authorship of the article "Pulpit Eloquence" (1826) is that Brougham included it in his *Contributions*. Of more importance, perhaps, is the fact that no one else seems to have laid the slightest claim to it.

The internal evidence concerning its authorship is not so explicit as that found within some of the previously considered articles. Frequent references to Demosthenes, Brougham's ideal orator, and to other ancients, such as Cicero and Isocrates, with whose writings Brougham was familiar, reveal a typical mode of Brougham criticism, but do not establish a solid claim for his authorship. Still, the whole tenor of the article sounds like Brougham. The article is mostly concerned with the style of pulpit eloquence, and the comments are centered around the hatred of style for style's sake. The insistence upon functionalism in style is inherent in all of Brougham's comments upon that phase of rhetoric. In appraising the style of Bossuet, the article criticizes him for being unctuous, and for lacking sufficient subject matter:

> His funeral sermons, which alone he laboured with such care as to leave in a perfect state, although replete with exalted passages, where much dignity is united with very exquisite composition, have nevertheless such a sickening sweetness diffused over them, contain so little solid matter upon which the ornament is fine drawn, and show in the ornament such defect of manly and original genius, that they oftener tire out our patience and pall upon the appetite, than afford gratification; while their perpetual exclamations and apostrophes, their gross exaggerations, and the never-ending *onction* of thought and expression, is calculated not a little to excite disgust, in a reader of correct taste and masculine understanding.[26]

On the other hand, the article praises the more chaste and masculine styles of Massillon and Bourdaloue. While such comments cannot be considered definite evidence of Brougham's authorship, they certainly must be considered an important indication of it. They are comments which a man would have made who found the diffuseness of Burke faulty and the simplicity of Fox admirable. In the absence of any evidence claiming this article for someone else, it can tentatively be assigned to Brougham.

VI

The "Demostlienes" article of January, 1820, was not claimed by Brougham in his *Contributions*, but was attributed to him in the Aspinall, Copinger, and the unpublished Cockburn lists. The lists pertaining to the contributions of other individuals do not mention it. There is, however, a strong piece of external evidence against Brougham's having written it. In addition to not including it in his *Contributions*, Brougham refers to it thus in a footnote in that work: "This was an able and learned article of Mr. Justice Williams on the same edition of Demosthenes.—*Edinburgh Review*, January 1820."[27] Such a specific attribution of authorship to another cannot be overlooked, even if evidence in the lists points to Brougham himself.

Internal evidence shows that save for formulating a rather severe standard for style, this article contains nothing which could concretely prove Brougham to be its author. Moreover, one item argues against such a thesis. There is a

[26] Brougham, *Contributions*, I, 105-106.
[27] Brougham, *Contributions*, I, 25.

major inconsistency concerning the oratory of Fox and Demosthenes as expressed in this article and as expressed by Brougham in the 1839 edition of the *Statesmen of the Time of George III*. In the 1820 article we read:

> No speaker has approached so nearly, in general resemblance and manner, to Demosthenes, as Mr. Fox. No politician, we believe, and few scholars, understood and admired the old master more perfectly. Many striking properties and qualities were the same in both. A certain sincerity and open-heartedness of manner,—an apparently entire and thorough conviction of being in the right,—an everlasting pursuit of, and an entire devotion to the subject, to the seeming neglect and forgetfulness of everything else,—an abrupt tone of vehemence and indignation,—a steadfast love of freedom, and corresponding hatred of oppression in all its forms,—a natural and idiomatic style,—vigour, argument, power—these were the characteristics equally of the Greek and English orator. Even in the details, in their hurried and hasty transitions,—in their use of parentheses to get rid of minor topics as they proceed, and in general structure of sentences, it would not be difficult to point out frequent similarity.[28]

What Brougham wrote in the 1839 edition of the *Statesmen of the Time of George III* is almost directly contradictory to this:

> . . . some have compared Mr. Fox's eloquence to that of Demosthenes; but it resembled Lord Chatham's just as much, if not more. It was incomparably more argumentative than either the Greek or the English orator's; neither of whom carried on chains of close reasoning as he did, though both kept close to their subject. It was, however, exceedingly the reverse of the Attic orator's in method, in diction, in conciseness. It had nothing like arrangement of any kind. Except in the more vehement passages, its diction was perhaps as slovenly, certainly as careless as possible, betokening indeed a contempt of all accurate composition. It was diffuse in the highest degree, and abounded in repetitions. While the Greek was concise, almost to being jejune, the Englishman was diffuse, almost to being prolix. How the notion of comparing the two together ever could have prevailed seems unaccountable. . . . But that the most elaborate and artificial compositions in the world [Demosthenes'] should have been likened to the most careless, and natural, and unprepared, that were ever delivered in public, [Fox's] would seem incredible if it were not true.[29]

It must be added that Brougham conceived of Fox as a great orator despite his lack of similarity to Demosthenes. What these excerpts present is a difference of opinion not so much concerning Fox's stature as an orator as concerning his oratorical method. It seems very unlikely that such differing concepts came from the same pen. Because of this conflict in the internal evidence, and because the external evidence is likewise not clear, I do not feel that this article can be claimed for Brougham.

My investigation produced a similar conclusion with regard to the 1822 article on Demosthenes. Brougham did not reprint it in his *Contributions*, and it is not mentioned in any of his writings. It is attributed to him in the Aspinall list, to Brougham and Williams in the Copinger list, to Jeffrey in the Cockburn list, and to Brougham by the editor of Lord Brougham's *Opinions*. A letter of Lord Jeffrey's to Charles Wilkes tends to support the Cockburn list and Brougham's *Contributions:* "I write nothing myself but . . . a part of Demosthenes, not the translations."[30] As the translations were mostly from the *De Corona*, Brougham's favorite Demosthenean oration, it appears likely that he may have done them, leaving the criticism proper to Jeffrey.

My investigation of the internal evidence concerning the authorship of this essay presented one conception which seems contradicted rather strongly in

[28] *Edinburgh Review* XXXIII (January 1820), 242.

[29] Brougham, *Statesmen of the Time of George III* (London and Glasgow, 1839), I, 42-43.

[30] Cockburn, *Life of Jeffrey*, II, 260. Letter dated April 13, 1822.

works known to be Brougham's. The 1822 article conceived of Demosthenes as a master of argument: ". . . we have no difficulty in saying, that, in all his orations, and throughout every part of them, the principal feature and the leading characteristic is argument. . . ."[31] In his "Dissertation," Brougham stated that it would be a mistake to represent Demosthenes as "distinguished by great closeness of reason." He added that, if it were thought that Demosthenes made speeches in which long chains of elaborate reasoning are to be found, "nothing can be less like the truth."[32] Here again we seem to encounter two varying concepts of a speaker's methodology. However, it is mainly the conflict in the external evidence which militates against assigning the article to Brougham. Words like "argument" and "reasoning" allow for too many semantic variations; it is possible that the apparent inconsistency in the internal evidence is not proof of anything.

VII

In conclusion, my investigation shows that on the basis of the evidence available to me, the 1810 and 1812 articles on Erskine, the 1813 article on Cicero, and the 1821 article on Demothenes are almost certainly Brougham's. Principally because of the lack of any rival claimants, the 1826 article on pulpit eloquence appears likely to have been also his. Counterclaims and conflicts in internal and external evidence make Brougham's authorship of the 1820 and 1822 articles on Demosthenes appear unlikely. Thus Brougham's *Contributions* seem to offer articles which can rightfully be assigned to him. Of course, any conclusions of this nature must remain tentative; there is always the possibility that new evidence will invalidate some of them.

One sound conclusion emerges, however, from this investigation: more work in identifying the authors of articles in the *Edinburgh Review* needs to be done. Scholars in all academic fields should be concerned, and scholars in Speech no less than others. Many articles which concern Speech and drama in the *Review* remain with their authorship in doubt. Investigation of this matter can be frustrating and tedious, but it must be continued. The *Edinburgh Review* was too important a clarion of English opinion for its authors to remain anonymous forever.

[31] *Edinburgh Review*, XXXVI (February 1822), 488.
[32] Brougham, *Speeches*, IV, 132.

WHAT SUCCEEDS WITH AN AUDIENCE IS BAD

Talking, one day, of a public discourse, Henry remarked that whatever succeeded with the audience was bad. I said, "Who would not like to write something which all can read, like Robinson Crusoe? and who does not see with regret that his page is not solid with a right materialistic treatment, which delights everybody?" Henry objected, of course, and vaunted the better lectures which reached only a few persons. But, at supper, a young girl, understanding that he was to lecture at the Lyceum, sharply asked him, "Whether his lecture would be a nice, interesting story, such as she wished to hear, or whether it was one of those old philosophical things that she did not care about." Henry turned to her, and bethought himself, and, I saw, was trying to believe that he had matter that might fit her and her brother, who were to sit up and go to the lecture, if it was a good one for them.

Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Thoreau.*

THE FORUM

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The Nominating Committee of the Speech Association of America (Auer, Braden, and Konigsberg elected by the Association, Rahskopf and Wallace elected by the Executive Council) submits the following nominations in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution and Bylaws which became operative on January 1, 1956:

FOR SECOND VICE PRESIDENT

(one to be elected)

John E. Dietrich, Ohio State U., Columbus, Ohio

T. Earle Johnson, U. of Alabama, University, Ala.

FOR THE ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

(two to be elected)

Robert D. Clark, U. of Oregon, Eugene, Ore.
Jon Eisenson, Queens Col., Flushing, N. Y.
Marie K. Hochmuth, U. of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
Karl F. Robinson, Northwestern U., Evanston, Ill.

FOR THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

MEMBERS AT LARGE

[The assignment of nominees for members at large to one, two, or three year terms, was made by lot.]

Three Year Term

(thirty to be elected)

William W. Adams, State U. Teachers Col., Cortland, N. Y.
Edward P. Atzert, S.S., St. John's Seminary, Plymouth, Mich.
John W. Bachman, Union Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.
Barnet Baskerville, U. of Washington, Seattle, Wash.
C. C. Bender, Emerson Col., Boston, Mass.
Paul H. Boase, Oberlin Col., Oberlin, Ohio
Gladys L. Borchers, U. of Wisconsin, Madison Wis.
Ernest G. Bormann, Eastern Illinois State Col., Charleston, Ill.
Wiley C. Bowyer, Mineola H. S., New York, N. Y.
Earnest S. Brandenburg, Washington U., St. Louis, Mo.
Mrs. Helen E. Brown, Flint, Mich.
Marion M. Carey, Philip Livingston Junior H. S., Albany, N. Y.
Maybelle Conger, Central H. S., Oklahoma City, Okla.
C. David Cornell, Pomona Col., Claremont, Calif.
W. Roy Diem, Ohio Wesleyan U., Delaware, Ohio
Earl Emery Fleischman, Col. of the City of New York, New York, N. Y.
Wofford G. Gardner, U. of Maine, Orono, Me.
James L. Golden, Pasadena Col. (Nazarene), Pasadena, Calif.
Warren Guthrie, Western Reserve U., Cleveland, Ohio
Frederick W. Haberman, U. of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
Theodore D. Hanley, Purdue U., Lafayette, Ind.
Robert C. Jeffrey, U. of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.
Claude E. Kantner, Ohio U., Athens, Ohio
Paul W. Keller, Manchester Col., North Manchester, Ind.
John W. Keltner, Kansas State Col., Manhattan, Kans.
Paul Kozelka, Teachers Col., Columbia U., New York, N. Y.
Donald L. McConkey, Col. of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.
Katherine B. McFarland, State Teachers Col., East Stroudsburg, Pa.
Vera Ellen Malton, Shepherd Col., Shepherdstown, W. Va.
Norman W. Mattis, U. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.
A. Florence May, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Ala.
Marjorie May, Area Joint H. S., Pen Argyl, Pa.
Francine Merritt, Louisiana State U., Baton Rouge, La.

Virginia R. Miller, Wellesley Col., Wellesley, Mass.
Richard Murphy, U. of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
Oliver W. Nelson, U. of Washington, Seattle, Wash.
Theodore F. Nelson, St. Olaf Col., Northfield, Minn.
Dean G. Nichols, U. of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo.
E. Ray Nichols, Jr., Whittier Col., Whittier, Calif.
Joseph H. North, Iowa State Col., Ames, Iowa
Mary Lou Plugge, Adelphi Col., Garden City, N. Y.
David Potter, Michigan State U., East Lansing, Mich.
Ivan L. Rehn, Lyons Township H. S. and Junior Col., La Grange, Ill.
Frank L. Roberts, Portland State Extension Center, Portland, Ore.
Horace W. Robinson, U. of Oregon, Eugene, Ore.
James L. Robinson, U. of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.
Rex E. Robinson, Utah State Col., Logan, Utah
Herold Truslow Ross, DePauw U., Greencastle, Ind.
Edward Stasheff, U. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Dorothy I. Summers, East Central State Col., Ada, Okla.
Marion Cass Tripp, Children's Rehabilitation Institute for Cerebral Palsy, Reisterstown, Md.
Robert G. Tuttle, Hastings Col., Hastings, Nebr.
Otis Monroe Walter, Jr., U. of Houston, Houston, Texas
Harold Weiss, Southern Methodist U., Dallas, Texas
Charlotte G. Wells, U. of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
Charles E. Weniger, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Washington, D. C.
Edna West, Northwestern State Col., Natchitoches, La.
Albert E. Whitehead, U. of Idaho, Moscow, Ida.
Carl L. Wilson, South Dakota State Col., College Station, S. Dak.
Margaret L. Wood, Illinois State Teachers Col., DeKalb, Ill.

Two Year Term
(thirty to be elected)

John Wm. Ackley, San Diego State Col., San Diego, Calif.
Roberta Barnett, Ithaca Col., Ithaca, N. Y.
Wynett Barnett, Wisconsin State Col., Whitewater, Wis.
Fred J. Barton, Abilene Christian Col., Abilene, Texas
Tom C. Battin, U. of Houston, Houston, Texas
Fred G. Blanchard, New York U., New York, N. Y.
Wayne E. Brockriede, U. of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
Mrs. Elnora Carrino, New York State Col. for Teachers, Albany, N. Y.
Merrill G. Christopherson, U. of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C.
William A. Conboy, U. of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan.
LeRoy Cowperthwaite, Kent State U., Kent, O.
Rupert L. Cortright, Wayne U., Detroit, Mich.
Frances Cox, Newport News Pub. Schls., Newport News, Va.
Jack Erskine Douglas, U. of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.
Henry L. Ewbank, Jr., Purdue U., Lafayette, Ind.
Seth A. Fessenden, Montana State U., Missoula, Mont.
David G. Flemming, U. of Wichita, Wichita, Kan.
Paul W. Gauger, U. of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
Leland M. Griffin, Boston U., Boston, Mass.
Inez E. Hegarty, Mount Holyoke Col., South Hadley, Mass.
Mrs. Annabel Dunham Hagood, U. of Alabama, University, Ala.
David S. Hawes, Indiana U., Bloomington, Ind.
Thomas A. Hopkins, Mount Mercy Col., Pittsburgh, Pa.
Sister John Baptist Hull, St. Joseph's Col., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Thelma A. Knudson, South Bend Pub. Schls., South Bend, Ind.
Zelda Horner Kosh, Arlington Pub. Schls., Arlington, Va.
P. Merville Larson, Texas Technological Col., Lubbock, Texas
Mrs. Norma Lee Lucas, Clayton H. S., Clayton, Mo.
Elaine McDavitt, Iowa State Teachers Col., Cedar Falls, Iowa
James W. McIntyre, Case Institute of Technology, Cleveland, Ohio
Mrs. Alethea Smith Mattingly, U. of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.
N. Edd Miller, U. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Wayne C. Minnick, Florida State U., Tallahassee, Fla.
Karl R. Moll, Rutgers U., New Brunswick, N. J.
Roy D. Murphy, Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Lafayette, La.
Charles E. Moore, Proviso Township H. S., Maywood, Ill.
Raymond H. Myers, U. of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wis.
Mrs. Agnes D. Nelson, Istrouma H. S., Baton Rouge, La.
John J. Pruis, Western Michigan Col., Kalamazoo, Mich.
Brooks Quimby, Bates Col., Lewistown, Me.
Carrie Rasmussen, Madison Pub. Schls., Madison, Wis.
Mary Margaret Robb, U. of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.
Edward A. Rogge, U. of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
Lousene G. Rousseau, Harper and Brothers, New York, N. Y.
Paul F. Rosser, Seattle Pacific Col., Seattle, Wash.
Howard William Runkel, Willamette U., Salem, Ore.
Earl H. Ryan, Col. of the City of New York, New York, N. Y.
Ray H. Sandefur, U. of Akron, Akron, Ohio
Ralph N. Schmidt, Utica Col. of Syracuse U., Utica, N. Y.
Theodore Skinner, Lamar State Col. of Technology, Beaumont, Texas
Joseph F. Smith, U. of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H.
James J. Stansell, Los Angeles State Col., Los Angeles, Calif.
James M. Starr, Junior Col., Wenatchee, Wash.
Warren L. Strausbaugh, U. of Maryland, College Park, Md.
George Thomas Tade, Greenville Col., Greenfield, Ill.
Marion L. Underwood, Glendale H. S., Glendale, Calif.
William E. Utterback, Ohio State U., Columbus, Ohio
John A. Walker, Michigan State U., East Lansing, Mich.
Elizabeth Worrell, Northeast Missouri State Teachers Col., Kirksville, Mo.
Dorothy M. Youngblood, East H. S., Aurora, Ill.

One Year Term
(thirty to be elected)

Otis J. Aggertt, Albion Col., Albion, Mich.
Genevieve Arnold, U. of Houston, Houston, Tex.
Joseph H. Baccus, U. of Redlands, Redlands, Calif.
Elmer E. Baker, Jr., New York U., New York, N. Y.
C. Laverne Bane, U. of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah
Geraldine F. Billings, H. S., Oskaloosa, Ia.
George V. Bohman, Wayne U., Detroit, Mich.
Winston L. Brembeck, U. of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
Glenn R. Capp, Baylor U., Waco, Texas
Gloria Ann Cappellanti, Seton Hall Col., Greensburg, Pa.
Clark S. Carlile, Idaho State Col., Pocatello, Idaho
Sene R. Carlile, Western Washington Col. of Education, Bellingham, Wash.
Paul Alfred Carmack, Ohio State U., Columbus, Ohio
Mrs. Elizabeth B. Carr, U. of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H.
Martin T. Cobin, U. of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
Sherod J. Collins, Northeast Missouri State Teachers Col., Kirksville, Mo.
Nicholas M. Cripe, Butler U., Indianapolis, Ind.
Lionel G. Crocker, Denison U., Granville, Ohio
Albert J. Croft, U. of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.
Laura Crowell, U. of Washington, Seattle, Wash.
Eva G. Currie, U. of Texas, Austin, Texas
Mildred Ann Ditty, U. of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Margaret M. Dunn, Sewauhaka Central H. S., Floral Park, N. Y.
Delwin B. Dusenbury, Temple U., Philadelphia, Pa.
Marceline Louise Erickson, Mankato State Teachers Col., Mankato, Minn.
Thorrel B. Fest, U. of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.
Austin J. Freeley, Boston U., Boston, Mass.
Robert G. Gunderson, Oberlin Col., Oberlin, Ohio
Robert Haakenson, U. of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
Mrs. Agnes Curren Hamm, Mount Mary Col., Milwaukee, Wis.
William V. Haney, DePaul U., Chicago, Ill.
Bruno E. Jacob, National Forensic League, Ripon, Wis.
Albert E. Johnson, Texas Col. of Arts and Industries, Kingsville, Texas
E. Orville Johnson, Earlham Col., Richmond, Ind.
Rose B. Johnson, Shades Valley H. S., Birmingham, Ala.
Herold Lillywhite, U. of Oregon Medical School, Portland, Ore.
Klonda Lynn, U. of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.

Lowell G. McCoy, Hebrew Union Col., Chardon, Ohio
Robert C. Martin, Lake Forest Col., Lake Forest, Ill.
Jeanne Elise Miles, Vassar Col., Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Ada Miner, Shoreline Pub. Schls., Seattle, Wash.
Wanda B. Mitchell, Township H. S. and Junior Col., Evanston, Ill.
Alan H. Monroe, Purdue U., Lafayette, Ind.
Laurence E. Norton, Bradley U., Peoria, Ill.
Cullen B. Owens, U. of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. M.
John S. Penn, U. of North Dakota, Grand Forks, N. Dak.
R. Corbin Pennington, Col. of the City of New York, New York, N. Y.
Lindsey S. Perkins, Brooklyn Col., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Owen M. Peterson, Louisiana State U., Baton Rouge, La.
Gilbert George Rau, Central Missouri State Col., Warrensburg, Mo.
Robert Stanley Rutherford, State U. Teachers Col., Geneseo, N. Y.
William Stephen Smith, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala.
D. Glenn Starlin, U. of Oregon, Eugene, Ore.
Donald C. Streeter, Memphis State Col., Memphis, Tenn.
Duane E. Tucker, Oregon State Col., Corvallis, Ore.
Joseph Anthony Wagner, Long Beach State Col., Long Beach, Calif.
Grace Walsh, Wisconsin State Col., Eau Claire, Wis.
Barbara Wellington, Durfee H. S., Fall River, Mass.
Forest L. Whan, Kansas State Col., Manhattan, Kans.
Joseph E. Wright, Vanderbilt U., Nashville, Tenn.

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA MEMBERS

Eastern Area: Three Year Term
(four to be elected)

Carroll C. Arnold, Cornell U., Ithaca, N. Y.
Marvin G. Bauer, Brooklyn Col., Brooklyn, N. Y.
H. Barrett Davis, Lehigh U., Bethlehem, Pa.
James H. Henning, West Virginia U., Morgantown, W. Va.
Paul D. Holtzman, Queens Col., Flushing, N. Y.
Magdalene Kramer, Teachers Col., Columbia U., New York, N. Y.
David C. Phillips, U. of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn.
Joseph F. O'Brien, Pennsylvania State U., State College, Pa.

Eastern Area: Two Year Term
(four to be elected)

J. Calvin Callaghan, Syracuse U., Syracuse, N. Y.
Helen M. Donovan, Board of Ed., New York, N. Y.
Wilbur E. Gilman, Queens Col., Flushing, N. Y.
Eleanor M. Luse, U. of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.
Yetta G. Mitchell, New York U., New York, N. Y.
Robert T. Oliver, Pennsylvania State U., State College, Pa.
John A. Oostendorp, U. of Rhode Island, Kingston, R. I.
William S. Tacey, U. of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Eastern Area: One Year Term
(four to be elected)

Geraldine Garrison, Connecticut State Dept. of Ed., Hartford, Conn.
Gordon F. Hostettler, Temple U., Philadelphia, Pa.
Ray E. Keesey, U. of Delaware, Newark, Del.
Orvin Larson, Brooklyn Col., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Letitia E. Raubicheck, Board of Ed., New York, N. Y.
Marion Parsons Robinson, Goucher Col., Baltimore, Md.
Lloyd W. Welden, Jr., U. of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Melvin R. White, Brooklyn Col., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Central Area: Three Year Term
(four to be elected)

Alice Donaldson, H. S., Clayton, Mo.
Max Fuller, The Maytag Corp., Newton, Ia.
William S. Howell, U. of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
Dorothy Kester, Pub. Schls., Akron, Ohio
Leroy T. Laase, U. of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
William M. Sattler, U. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Hugh F. Seabury, State U. of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa
Wayne N. Thompson, U. of Ill., Chicago Div., Navy Pier, Chicago, Ill.

Central Area: Two Year Term
(four to be elected)

Charles L. Balcer, State Teachers Col., St. Cloud, Minn.

Samuel L. Becker, State U. of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa
Kim Giffin, U. of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.
Charles P. Green, U. of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.
Martin J. Holcomb, Augustana Col., Rock Island, Ill.
Robert A. Johnston, S.J., St. Louis U., St. Louis, Mo.
Mrs. Bea Olmstead, Hamtramck Pub. Schls., Hamtramck, Mich.
Zack L. York, Western Michigan Col. of Ed., Kalamazoo, Mich.

Central Area: One Year Term
(four to be elected)

G. Bradford Barber, Illinois State Normal U., Normal, Ill.
Donald E. Bird, Stephens Col., Columbia, Mo.
Edna E. Gilbert, State Teachers Col., Minot, N. Dak.
Harold M. Jordan, U. of South Dakota, Vermillion, S. Dak.
Charlotte I. Lee, Northwestern U., Evanston, Ill.
Ordean G. Ness, U. of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
Victor M. Powell, Wabash Col., Crawfordsville, Ind.
M. D. Steer, Purdue U., Lafayette, Ind.

Southern Area: Three Year Term
(four to be elected)

Harvey Cromwell, Mississippi State Col. for Women, Columbus, Miss.
Mrs. Louise D. Davison, Davison Schl. of Sp. Cor., Atlanta, Ga.
Sara Lowrey, Furman U., Greenville, S. C.
Mrs. Marguerite Pearce Metcalf, Central H. S., Little Rock, Ark.
Florence Pass, H. S., Birmingham, Ala.
Harold Weiss, Southern Methodist U., Dallas, Texas
Joseph C. Wetherby, Duke U., Durham, N. C.
Eugene E. White, University of Miami, Miami, Fla.

Southern Area: Two Year Term
(four to be elected)

C. Cordelia Brong, Louisiana State U., Baton Rouge, La.
Frank B. Davis, Alabama Polytechnic Inst., Auburn, Ala.
Mary Louis Gehring, Mississippi Southern Col., Hattiesburg, Miss.
Charles M. Getchell, U. of Mississippi, University, Miss.
M. Blair Hart, U. of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.
Thomas R. Lewis, Florida State U., Tallahassee, Fla.
Jesse J. Villarreal, U. of Texas, Austin, Texas
H. Waldo Wasson, Southwestern Louisiana Inst., Lafayette, La.

Southern Area: One Year Term
(four to be elected)

Stanley H. Ainsworth, U. of Georgia, Athens, Ga.
Douglas Ehninger, U. of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.
Carroll Brooks Ellis, David Lipscomb Col., Nashville, Tenn.
Marian Gallaway, U. of Alabama, University, Ala.
Freda Kenner, Messick H. S., Memphis, Tenn.
E. R. Minchew, H. S., Castor, La.
Claude L. Shaver, Louisiana State U., Baton Rouge, La.
Franklin R. Shirley, Wake Forest Col., Wake Forest, N. C.

Western Area: Three Year Term
(four to be elected)

Virgil A. Anderson, Stanford U., Stanford, Calif.
Wayne C. Eubank, U. of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. M.
Norman Wm. Freestone, Occidental Col., Los Angeles, Calif.
Charles W. Lomas, U. of California, Los Angeles, Calif.
Lawrence H. Mouat, San Jose State Col., San Jose, Calif.
Orville L. Pence, U. of Washington, Seattle, Wash.
Horace G. Rahskopf, U. of Washington, Seattle, Wash.
Earl W. Wells, Oregon State Col., Corvallis, Ore.

Western Area: Two Year Term
(four to be elected)

Mrs. Vera Breinholt, Orange Co. Pub. Schls., Santa Ana, Calif.
Don Geiger, U. of California, Berkeley, Calif.
Donald E. Hargis, U. of California, Los Angeles, Calif.
William B. McCoard, U. of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
Alonzo J. Morley, Brigham Young U., Provo, Utah

Elwood Murray, U. of Denver, Denver, Colo.
Upton S. Palmer, U. of California, Santa Barbara, Calif.
Waldo W. Phelps, U. of California, Los Angeles, Calif.

Western Area: One Year Term
(four to be elected)

Johnnye Akin, U. of Denver, Denver, Colo.
Earl E. Bradley, U. of Denver, Denver, Colo.
Arthur Cable, U. of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.
S. Judson Crandell, State Col. of Washington, Pullman, Wash.
Clifford Hamar, Lewis and Clark Col., Portland, Ore.
Susie S. Niles, Pub. Schls., Salt Lake City, Utah
Mrs. Elizabeth Fatherson Russell, U. of California, Berkeley, Calif.
Garff Wilson, U. of California, Berkeley, Calif.

WALDO W. BRADEN
EVELYN KONIGSBERG
HORACE G. RAHSKOPF
KARL R. WALLACE
J. JEFFERY AUER, *Chairman*

DEMOCRATIC ATHENS

Our constitution does not copy the laws of neighboring states; we are rather a pattern to others than imitators ourselves. Its administration favors the many instead of the few; this is why it is called a democracy. If we look to the laws, they afford equal justice to all in their private differences; if to social standing, advancement in public life falls to reputation for capacity, class considerations not being allowed to interfere with merit; nor again does poverty bar the way, if a man is able to serve the state, he is not hindered by the obscurity of his condition. The freedom which we enjoy in our government extends also to our ordinary life. There, far from exercising a jealous surveillance over each other, we do not feel called upon to be angry with our neighbor for doing what he likes, or even to indulge in those injurious looks which cannot fail to be offensive, although they inflict no positive penalty.

Pericles, Funeral Oration.

WORDS

A few words, well chosen and distinguished, will do work that a thousand cannot, when every one is acting, equivocally, in the function of another. Yes; and words, if they are not watched, will do deadly work sometimes. There are masked words droning and skulking about us in Europe just now (there never were so many, owing to the spread of a shallow, blotching, blundering, infectious "information," or rather deformation, everywhere, and to the teaching of catechism and phrases at schools instead of human meanings)—there are masked words abroad, I say, which nobody understands, but which everybody uses, and most people will also fight for, live for, or even die for, fancying they mean this or that or the other of things dear to them; for such words wear chameleon cloaks,—"ground-lion" cloaks, of the color of the ground of any man's fancy; on that ground they lie in wait, and rend him with a spring from it.

John Ruskin, *Sesame.*

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

LELAND M. GRIFFIN, *Editor*

THOUHTS ON ANTHOLOGIES

Leland M. Griffin

A writer in the *Boston Traveler* has recently announced that the most popular of American pastimes, next to photography and philately, is the breeding, feeding, and miscellaneous "fancying" of tropical fish. At the moment there seems to be no official word as to the pursuit that stands fourth in the national hierarchy of hobbies; but even a casual glance at the latest publishers' lists would seem to confirm the rumors, now current among the critics, of an alarming increase in the popularity of anthologizing.

Now there is nothing particularly new about anthologizing, either as leisure pursuit or profession; nor anything about it, at least on the surface, that would seem particularly disturbing. To be sure, it has always been a pastime best suited to the essentially bibliophagous: to those possessed of a virtually unappeasable appetite for print, along with the ability to experience—while engaged in worrying a book to the bone—the immeasurable happiness of a hound with a hamhock. But who is this Happy Worrier—who is he, at any rate, to have spread such consternation in the ranks of the critical brotherhood? At his worst, after all, he is only a tasteless hack; a fabricator of obese volumes of drossy hoardings; a maker of books whose primary use is to testify to the power of the ill-read to assemble the unreadable. At his best, on the other hand, the anthologist is a kind of *aficionado* in the field of letters; a fellow of infinitely discriminating passion for the best that has been thought, said, and previously committed to print; a fancier of the finest in prose and poetry—whether his forte be the funny, the familiar, the fugitive, the fabulous, or whatever.

As for the anthology itself, it may indeed—at its worst—amount to nothing more than a misbegotten mash of the trite, the trivial, the unmemorable. "Anthologies are sickly things," said Francis Palgrave, "cut flowers have no vitality . . . the splendid bouquet decays into unsavoury trash, and as trash is thrown away. . . ." But this was the Palgrave of the multivolumed and long forgotten *History of Normandy and England:* his son it was—and well he deserved him—who put together that *Golden Treasury* recently described, by no less an authority than Walter J. Black of the Classics Club, as "the most famous anthology of England's poetic literature," "the ultimate authority on English verse," "essential in any personal library!" At its best, then, the anthology may be thought of as a kind of cornucopia containing the choicest fruits of the fancier's fancy. (Flowers, rather than fruits, would give us the more etymologically accurate figure, to be sure; but it is a sad fact—and perhaps one in the critic's favor—that few anthologists nowadays are content to call an anthology an anthology. The

fine old vision of themselves as literary floriculturists has all but vanished. Perhaps Palgrave himself is to blame. Or perhaps it is only a symptom of our materialistic times that anthologists should prefer to call their collections "treasuries" and think of themselves, apparently, as numismatists or bursars).

Whatever the precise nature of the anthologist and his art, literary and social critics are substantially agreed that not only have his numbers undergone a remarkable increase in recent years, but that an ever-expanding portion of the populace, even now, is expending its energies in anthologizing. And the critics are showing signs of concern. Those inclined to sound the alarum at the sight of a Trend have been sounding the alarum. Those of more sensitive stripe, whose specialty is to become "frankly frightened" at the speck of a spectre in the social scene, have become, as they put it, "frankly frightened." Others, not so much sensitive as downright pusillanimous, have found the phenomenon so frightful—the anthology in its accretion so fearful, the anthologist in his increase so fruitful—that they have headed howling for the hills. And still others—cultural historians, for the most part, with an eye for omens and a taste for dabbling in the nomenclature of the ages—have stated quite bluntly that the current anthological activity is merely one more portent (along with the falling of the water table, the northering of the rattlesnake, and the gibbering of the sheeted dead in the streets) of the Impending Doom of the West. The old order changeth, say they, and the new age struggles to be born: as Stone gave way to Bronze, and Atom to Anxiety, so Anxiety yields to Anthology.

Now admittedly, strange things have been happening: remarkable occurrences that would seem to support the theory that a weird new virus—a kind of communicable anthological itch, as it were—is at work among us. Consider, for example, the curious case of Cleveland Amory. Brooding not long ago over a list of some thirty titles representing "just two month's worth of anthologies," the normally amiable Amory suddenly broke out with a rash proposal for an anthology of his own—an "anthology of anthologies"which he promised, in his phrensy, to entitle "The Garden of Eden." Or again, consider the jarring record of Randall Jarrell. As one who has spoken of ours as "the age of anthologies," the normally genteel Jarrell has not hesitated to comment with considerable acidity on "those cultural entrepreneurs, the anthologists'" (the "typical anthologist," Jarrell has jeered, "is a sort of Gallup Poll with connections"); nor has he scrupled—and this is the significant point—to *anthologize* his strictures on anthologists in a recent anthology, or at least collection, of his own compositions.

Yet even if the critics be right in their fears, need we panic? For surely an increase in anthologizing is a perfectly natural product of the problems that plague our pursy times—Television, Crowded Schools, Comic Books, McCarthyism, etc., etc. How else, after all, in this day of the indoor antenna, is the self-respecting sophisticate to prove himself innocent of owning a set—to establish that *his* days and nights are devoted to Addison, Augustine, and Mortimer Adler? How else, save he submit to a candid world some palpable evidence of the range of his reading? And what evidence more appropriate than some kind of publication? And what kind of publication more appropriate—or more palpable—than an

anthology? Or how else, again, is the impecunious and hard-pressed young pedagog—one of your poor, your tired, your huddled masses of instructors, yearning to breathe the professorial air—how else is he to mount the academic ladder, save on the rungs of publication? And what kind of publication so practical—or so publishable—as an anthology? And consider the comic book artist, whose Code demands of his drawings that they soil not, neither do they sin. . . .

But go to, let's no more on 't. It is enough to suggest that the critics see a Trend where no Trend is intended. Let them scorn not the anthology, and bear the anthologist bravely; for the latter is surely akin to the critic, and his lineage is almost as ancient. Indeed, the urge to anthologize is probably primordial: for though the encyclopedists insist that Meleager fathered the form with his *Garland* in 60 B.C., who can doubt that long before Meleager some rude forefather—some unsung Untermeyer—was not happily heaping up shards for the ur-anthology. In any case, let us leave to the critics any fears that ours is the Age of Anthology, and turn to the question that originally prompted this writing: *what are the anthologists up to?*

It goes without saying, of course, that the anthologists are busy as always with the fancying of the best in books, whether their forte be the funny, the familiar, the fugitive, the fabulous, or whatever. But on the assumption that something more specific might interest some few of our readers—those involved, perhaps, in the teaching or the taking of courses in reading aloud—let us attempt a brief survey of such of the current anthological output as has found its way to the editor's desk.

In beginning with the Funny as our first category, it would be helpful if we might divide the connoisseurs of the comic into the fanciers of light verse on the one hand, and the specialists in humorous prose on the other. Unfortunately, few of the available anthologies indicate that their compilers have been willing so to circumscribe their tastes; and the best we can do, very likely, is to separate the collectors who have concentrated on collecting themselves from those who have ranged somewhat farther in their anthologizing. And even with this disjunction, we must note an exception of sorts—a slight little volume which bears the eminently respectable title, *Useful and Instructive Poetry*,[1] and is, in fact, "a new book written and illustrated by Lewis Carroll—the first of his writings although the last to be published." The author, needless to say, can hardly be held responsible for the publication of this book: for that all plaudits go to Derek Hudson and Minella Dodgson (a niece), who have joined forces for the purpose of releasing to the world this sampling of the literary output of the young Lutwidge. All of the poems were written when the author was in his thirteenth year; and while it may be given to *Alice* cultists to hear in this juvenilia the horns of elfland faintly blowing, the best this reader can do is to detect an occasional carol in such lines as

> The juvenile Jenkins was jumping with joy,
> As he sported him over the sandy lea;
> In his small fat hand there was many a toy
> And many a cake in his mouth had he.

Among living light versifiers, it is good to note that Richard Armour,[2] Christopher Morley,[3] and Morris Bishop[4] have brought out collections of their latest accomplishments; and it is good to know, too, that *What Cheer*,[5] the superb collection of "humorous and witty verse" first "gathered, sifted and salted" by David McCord a decade ago, has

been brought out in a Modern Library edition. This book remains the best anthology of its kind on the market; and certainly, in its new edition, the best buy. It is interesting to note that McCord does not hesitate to include, among other new items, a brief "epigrim" from *Punch* entitled "Take Heart, Illiterates"

> For years a secret shame destroyed my peace—
> I'd not read Eliot, Auden or MacNeice.
> But now I think a thought that brings me hope:
> Neither had Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, Pope.

This little item is by Justin Richardson, who is responsible for some of the more amusing pages in William Cole's *The Best Humor from Punch*,[6] though not represented—as one might expect—by his little ode intimating illiteracy. American chaps who find the Cole volume rum going generally may find enlightenment, if not balm for the bruised ego, in reviewing Morris Bishop's analysis of *Punch* and the "aristocratic tradition" of its humor (see Preface, *Treasury of British Humor*, 1942). One must admit, however, that if much of the humor culled from the files of *Punch, or the London Charivari* seems as dated as the form of fun memorialized in the magazine's subtitle, it is nevertheless sobering to remember that those files stretch back to 1841. And it is even a bit saddening to think that the earliest example of parody that the compiler of *American Literature in Parody*[7] can provide is a thin item—"Mr. Copymore Fummer, Author of the Leather-leg Novels, Refuses an Invitation"—composed by Samuel Kettell in 1842. Robert P. Falk, the compiler in question, has made it his aim "to test the values of parody as criticism and to provide a kind of parody-handbook to American literature." Professor Falk has included some familiar pieces in his survey—e.g., Twain on Cooper, Harte on Whittier, E. B. White on Whitman—but a number of his parodies are reprinted, apparently, for the first time. Good anthologies of parody are as rare as good parody; and this, by and large, is an excellent anthology. "Good parody," incidentally, as Professor Falk defines it, is "a deflationary piece of matter and impertinency, in prose or verse, of brief duration which satirizes a literary style, personality or mannerism and provides the reader with a quiet explosion of mirth." It is this sort of thing, perhaps, that Max Shulman has in mind when he confesses—at the portals of the parody section of his own anthology—that "as an undergraduate writer, satire and burlesque were always the most fun. Even today, though my temples recede and my transmission needs oil, I still like to pick up a slapstick and belabor the arts, the sciences, and the humanities." There is something very close to the sadistic, however, in the conception underlying the *Guided Tour of Campus Humor*,[8] an anthology in which Shulman undertakes to provide a sampling of "the best stories, articles, jokes, songs, and nonsense from fifty years of college humor magazines." For an enterprise such as this—if it must needs come to pass—Shulman is surely the perfect fugleman. He is the undergraduate's undergraduate, and his instinct for the callow and the corny is close to uncanny (e.g., "There are a lot of couples who don't neck in parked cars. The woods are full of them"; "'I shall now illustrate what I have on my mind,' said the professor as he erased the blackboard," etc.). This is a *Tour*, then, for readers whose intellectual taste buds do not tremble at the thought of strained "Udder Drippings'" from old *Purple Cows;* otherwise, to fall back on the fine

old phrase of Baedeker, "there is little here that need detain the tourist." Like the Shulman book, Bennett Cerf's *Encyclopedia of Modern American Humor*[9] provides a tour of sorts. A geographical plan of arrangement has been adopted, at any rate, with sections devoted to "New England," "New York," "The Southland," "The Midwest," "The Far West." Cerf is such a practiced hand at this kind of anthologizing that he surely deserves to be known, like Caius Julius Caesar, as "the most facetious man of his time." Even so, it is nevertheless disappointing that his attempt to organize an anthology along regional lines results, for the most part, in the mere gerrymandering of the old familiar terrain.

But the Familiar itself is our second category, a pigeonhole intended to accommodate the collections of those who center their efforts not so much on anthologizing what is known as the best, as on anthologizing what is the best known. The editors of *The Golden Argosy*,[10] for example, have "set out deliberately to assemble those short stories most read, most often included in anthologies, most in demand at public libraries, and most familiar, if only by title, to the average reader." If the editors' "average reader" is like Virginia Wolfe's "common reader," he is one who "reads for his own pleasure rather than to impart knowledge or correct the opinions of others"—and he will undoubtedly long since have had the pleasure of reading most, if not all, of the forty stories in this book. But here, if he wants them—for the sake of "reference," as the editors suggest, or for some more dubious purpose—are such "tried-and-true favorites" as "The Gold-Bug," "The Gift of the Magi," "A Rose for Emily," "Tobermory," "The Lady, or the Tiger?" and "The Secret Life of Walter Mitty." This solicitude for the literary welfare of the "average" reader, incidentally, seems peculiarly characteristic of anthologists of the familiar. It was this "average American—not merely the average *bookish* American" —that Ralph R. Woods had in mind when he assembled his *A Treasury of the Familiar* (1942), a volume equalled in bulk and banality only by its successor, *A Second Treasury of the Familiar* (1950). Readers who know either volume will be acquainted with the editorial abandon with which Mr. Woods accomplishes such startling couplings as that of the "Oath Taken by U. S. Supreme Court Justices" with one of Shakespeare's songs, Lincoln's "Second Inaugural Address' with Louisa Macartney Crawford's "Kathleen Mavourneen," Ella Wheeler Wilcox's "Whatever Is—Is Best" with the "Burial of the Dead" from *The Book of Common Prayer*. Such readers may—or may not—be rejoiced to know that both volumes have been reprinted and brought out in a handsomely-boxed edition of formidable proportions.[11] These volumes contain much that is undeniably great, and their appearance on the bookshelf is undoubtedly gorgeous; but one thinks, somehow, of Hazlitt's confession that he hated "to see a load of band-boxes go along the street" because of his distaste for "anything that occupies more space than it is worth." Still another treasury of the familiar, but one built on a scale considerably more modest than the one just mentioned is Kenneth S. Giniger's *The Compact Treasury of Inspiration*.[12] Mr. Giniger has edited some of the writings of the Reverend Norman Vincent Peale, and the Reverend Norman Vincent Peale has contributed a Foreword to Mr. Giniger's book. The "work of inspiration," as Dr. Peale cogently ob-

serves, "may not always be important as literature but you may be certain that influencing even one man's life for the better is a greater and more lasting reward for the writer than all the praise that critics, professors and prize committees may heap upon him." The editor has set out to collect some of the best of such writing; and inspiration-wise, so to speak, it would be difficult to question such happy choices as Russell Conwell's "Acres of Diamonds," Elbert Hubbard's "A Message to Garcia," Longfellow's "Psalm of Life," Francis Pharcellus Church's "Is There a Santa Claus?," Harry Emerson Fosdick's "Adequate Power is Available," and James Keller's "Thank God for That!" Mr. Giniger has not armed his little book with an epigraph; but there is a couplet in Blake's Auguries of Innocence" that might serve him well.

A dove-house filled with doves and pigeons
Shudders hell through all its regions. . . .

Our third rubric, the Fugitive, may suffice not only to supply us with alliteration but also with a classification for the type of anthology that results when editors comb through old files of their journals or magazines in search of the least ephemeral of the pieces they have printed. A number of magazine anthologies have been published in recent years; and certainly not the least among them, in terms of enduring worth and interest, have been the anthologies developed by editors of certain of the outstanding literary reviews. Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren, the original managing editors of the *Southern Review*,[13] have collaborated once again to provide a brief but fascinating history of that distinguished quarterly, along with a generous sampling of the stories published during the eight years of the *Review's* history. Paul Bixler, who is chairman of the editorial board of the *Antioch Review*,[14] has assembled a collection of outstanding essays, stories, poems, and reviews from the pages of that fine journal; and William Phillips and Philip Rahv, the original editors and founders of *Partisan Review*, have brought out a second selection of their magazine's "best and most representative writing," this anthology covering the period from 1945 to 1953.[15] The editors' conception of the "ideal reader" will provide as good a guide as anything might to the general tone of the latter anthology: he is "receptive to new work in fiction, poetry, and art, is aware of the major tendencies in contemporary criticism, is concerned with the structure and fate of modern society, in particular with the precise nature and menace of Communism, is informed or wishes to become informed about new currents in psychoanalysis and the other humanistic sciences, is opposed to such "nativist" demagogues as Senator McCarthy and to all other varieties of know-nothingism, and feels above all that what happens in literature and the arts has a direct effect on the quality of his own life." All of which demonstrates (if it does not seem partisan to suggest it) that Marx may come and Marx may go, but Freud goes on forever.

Under our fourth heading, the Fabulous, we might point to several collections of folklore and balladry. The indefatigable B. A. Botkin has just released his fifth anthology of regional Americana, *A Treasury of Mississippi River Folklore*;[16] and in the opinion of Carl Carmer, who supplies the Foreword, it is the best of Mr. Botkin's collections. Vance Randolph has assembled some ninety tales for his third collection of Ozark folklore, *The Devil's Pretty Daughter*.[17] The secretary of the American Folklore Society, MacEdward

Leach, has collected texts, along with variants and analogs, of some 370 English, Scottish, and American ballads for *The Ballad Book*.[18] In addition to the ballads and their accompanying notes, Professor Leach has equipped his anthology with a careful study of the ballad as a literary form (including a useful discussion of "ballad reading"), as well as with an extensive bibliography, glossary, and selected list of ballad recordings. Still another ballad collection, *A Treasury of American Ballads: Gay, Naughty and Classic*,[19] has been assembled by Charles O'Brien Kennedy. Mr. Kennedy, an actor for more than fifty seasons, has attempted to pattern his book "after the old de-luxe vaudeville show, with an eye to quality and infinite variety." The resulting compilation is something less than scholarly, but it is surely the product of quite as much loving devotion as that bestowed by Mr. Leach on the more circumspect *Ballad Book*.

Other categories might well be developed, and many more titles undoubtedly deserve mention. It should probably be noted, for example, that Palgrave's *Golden Treasury* has been taken in hand by Oscar Williams and "revised, enlarged and brought up to date";[20] and that old Meleager himself, who was first to go into the flower-gathering business, is represented in a recent and most admirable anthology, *Voices from the Past*.[21] There must be an end to this essay, however; and in any case, "there seems to be no end," as Louis Untermeyer has observed, "to the compiling of anthologies." Which is one way of saying, perhaps, that if today's anthology is not to your taste, another will be published tomorrow; that the ideal anthology will one day come along. Whenever it appears, it will be worth waiting for—or will be, at least, for those who accept the idea of Keats "that a Man might pass a very pleasant life in this manner—let him on a certain day read a certain Page of full Poesy or distilled Prose, and let him wander with it, and muse upon it, and reflect upon it, and bring home to it, and prophesy upon it, and dream upon it, until it becomes stale—but when will it do so? Never. When Man has arrived at a certain ripeness in intellect any one grand and spiritual passage serves him as a starting-post towards all 'the two-and-thirty-Palaces.' "

BOOKS MENTIONED

1. *Useful and Instructive Poetry*. By Lewis Carroll, with an Introduction by Derek Hudson. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954; pp. 45. $2.50.
2. *Light Armour: Playful Poems on Practically Everything*. By Richard Armour. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1954; pp. ix+118. $2.75.
3. *Gentlemen's Relish*. By Christopher Morley. New York: W. W. Norton Company, 1955; pp. 100. $3.00.
4. *A Bowl of Bishop: Museum Thoughts and Other Verses*. By Morris Bishop. New York: Dial Press, 1954; pp. 106. $3.00.
5. *What Cheer*. An Anthology of American and British Humorous and Witty Verse. Gathered, sifted and salted, with an Introduction by David McCord. New York: The Modern Library, 1955; pp. xliv+515. $1.45.
6. *The Best Humor From Punch*. Edited by William Cole, and Illustrated by Sprod. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1953; pp. 350. $3.50.
7. *American Literature in Parody*. Edited by Robert P. Falk. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1955; pp. 279. $3.75.
8. *Guided Tour of Campus Humor*. Edited by Max Shulman. New York: Hanover House, 1955; pp. xxxii+456. $2.95.
9. *An Encyclopedia of Modern American Humor*. Edited by Bennett Cerf. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1954; pp. xvi+688. $3.95.
10. *The Golden Argosy*. Edited by Van H. Cartmell and Charles Grayson. New York: Dial Press, 1955; pp. 656. $6.00.
11. *A Treasury of the Familiar* and *A Second Treasury of the Familiar*. Edited by Ralph L. Woods. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955; pp. x+751 and xi+722. $6.50 and $6.00.
12. *The Compact Treasury of Inspiration*. Edited by Kenneth S. Giniger. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1955; pp. 313. $3.95.
13. *Stories from the Southern Review*. Edited by Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn War-

ren. Baton Rouge: The Louisiana State University Press, 1953; pp. xv+435. $6.00.

14. *The Antioch Review Anthology*. Edited by Paul Bixler. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1953; pp. ix+470. $6.00.
15. *The New Partisan Reader: 1945-1953*. Edited by William Phillips and Philip Rahv. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1953; pp. viii+621. $6.00.
16. *A Treasury of Mississippi River Folklore*. Edited by B. A. Botkin. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1955; pp. xx+620. $5.00.
17. *The Devil's Pretty Daughter*. Edited by Vance Randolph. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955; pp. xvi+239. $3.75.
18. *The Ballad Book*. Edited by MacEdward Leach. New York: Harper and Brothers, Inc., 1955; pp. xiv+842. $7.50.
19. *A Treasury of American Ballads: Gay, Naughty and Classic*. Edited by Charles O'Brien Kennedy. New York: The McBride Company, 1954; pp. xxvii+398. $4.75.
20. *The Golden Treasury of the Best Songs and Lyrical Poems*. Revised, enlarged and brought up to date by Oscar Williams. New York: The New American Library, 1953; pp. 532. $.50.
21. *Voices from the Past*. Edited by James and Janet Maclean Todd. New York: E. P. Dutton Company, 1955; pp. 550. $6.50.

LINCOLN THE PRESIDENT: LAST FULL MEASURE. By J. G. Randall and Richard N. Current. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1955; pp. vii+421. $7.50.

Last Full Measure is the fourth and final volume of J. G. Randall's biography of *Lincoln the President*. At the time of his death, early in 1953, Professor Randall had finished about half the manuscript for this book. The work was completed by Professor Richard N. Current, Head of the History and Political Science Department, Woman's College, University of North Carolina, from notes left by Professor Randall.

The study begins late in 1863 and continues through Appomattox until the fatal night in Ford's Theatre. It encompasses the complex issues of the closing months of the rebellion, including Reconstruction, the war front, foreign affairs, the national election of 1864, peace terms, the Thirteenth Amendment, and interlocking problems. It is a crowded canvas of incredible excitement and pandemonium, a picture of personalities and events tumbling over one another in an upside down world. Yet, so lucid is the recital, so orderly the management of details, the reader becomes a part of the situation and brushes shoulders with rogues and weaklings and notables, with dilettantes in gold braid, prima donnas in Congress more concerned with saving the profits of Northern business men than in co-operating with Lincoln in winning the war, newspaper men too insolent for words, draft dodgers, self-appointed peace-makers, cynical money-changers, and sundry others.

As the reader continues to turn the pages, however, he perceives a more balanced and discerning view of the national scene. The tall stooping form of the living Lincoln gradually becomes more clear, his voice more distinct. At times his words are muffled by the roar of battle guns and by the cries of sedition and defeatism and treason in city streets. At times his authority is flouted, his impeachment threatened. But slowly and surely he takes charge, making his presence felt as best he can, sometimes in a state paper, sometimes in a well-placed letter, sometimes in remarks addressed to visiting delegations at the White House, or in the intimate moments of his rare public utterances.

Then, by some alchemy of fortune, men of talent began to appear around him; and as the McClellans, the Fremonts, the Chases, and the Medills, faded into the background, we see their places taken by commanding figures like Grant, Farragut, Raymond: even a mellower Greeley edged closer to him. Came the national election of 1864, when the voters "back home" gave their thunderclap of confidence to the badgered man in the White House. Lincoln's ascendancy was now supreme, the restoration of the Union almost a reality. Professional gamblers at the time of his inaugural in 1865 were willing to wager money that he would be re-elected President in 1868.

Replete with illustrations, bibliography, index, this volume is fresh and lively in narrative, dispassionate in interpretation, though clearly sympathetic with Lincoln, and rich in new material bulwarked with a profusion of documented testimony. It is good literature as well as superb history. It surrounds Lincoln with the vicissitudes of agonizing events, yet it never buries him in the details. It delineates him not as the "gilded" Lincoln of song and poetry, untouched by the sordidness of life, but as a man of high intelligence dedicated to the great task of restoring the Union as a symbol and a challenge to free men everywhere. It reveals him as kindly and conciliatory in coping with friend and foe, yet a protagonist far shrewder and more far-seeing than those who would master him.

Dr. Current is to be congratulated on his contribution to the scholarly series of books

Dr. Randall projected on *Lincoln the President*. It is no easy matter for a writer to pick up another man's notes and put life and fire into them. Dr. Current has met the challenge so artistically that the merging point of the two styles is imperceptible. The result is a rounded conclusion to one of the soundest productions in American scholarship.

EARL W. WILEY,
The Ohio State University

THE METALOGICON OF JOHN OF SALISBURY. Translated with Introduction and Notes by Daniel D. McGarry. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1955; pp. xxvii+305. $5.00.

Charles Sears Baldwin termed the *Metalogicon* of John of Salisbury "the cardinal treatise of medieval pedagogy." The work, completed in 1159 A.D. during the so-called "Renaissance of the Twelfth Century," holds a unique position in the history of Western thought: first of all, it reveals the intellectual position of logicians who ultimately appropriated for logic some of the functions which the classical world had assigned to rhetoric; and secondly, it is probably the last major medieval treatise in which the educational theories of Quintilian are explicitly recommended.

Its author planned the book as a reply to critics—"the Cornificians"—who declared that "Rules of eloquence are superfluous, and that the possession or lack of eloquence is dependent upon nature." John's title, then, means *Defense of the Logos*, in the ancient Greek sense of logos as the double science of reasoning-expression. His method is to defend Grammar and Logic, which he sees as the two sciences which provide men with rules for speech.

Logic is defined as the "science of verbal expression and reasoning," which has as one of its parts Grammar, "the science of speaking correctly." He does not defend rhetoric as a third separate study—although the traditional *trivium* ordinarily makes this the third member of the triad. His omission is significant, for later theorists were to follow his lead by substituting Aristotle's *Topics* and *Sophistical Refutations* for the classical rhetorical works. John divides Logic into three types: demonstrative, probable (dialetic and rhetoric), and sophistical. It is evident that he cares little for rhetoric, since he mentions it no more than half a dozen times. On the other hand, he provides an extensive treatment of Logic.

This aspect alone would make the book valuable for the student of rhetorical history, but John's treatment of Quintilian provides a further insight into the history of classical influence in the Middle Ages. The *Metalogicon* frankly recommends the educational system which Quintilian describes in the opening sections of his *Institutio Oratoria*. Significantly, however, only the grammatical training is discussed in the *Metalogican*, and then only as John had learned it from Bernard of Chartres. There is no quotation from the rhetorical portion of the *Institutio*, and only one possible allusion to later books. Indeed, Colson and others have shown that John and the Chartres school possessed only the *textus mutilatus* of Quintilian—a manuscript which usually included no more than fragments of seven out of the original twelve books. For John of Salisbury, therefore, Quintilian is revered as a guide for grammatical rather than rhetorical studies.

Professor McGarry's translation is eminently readable, despite the large number of technical terms involved in such a book. His English style provides a good imitation of that Latin style which makes John of Salisbury one of the more interesting medieval writers. Modern readers are therefore likely to find this important translation interesting as well as profitable. A brief bibliography following the translation may be useful to students of medieval rhetoric.

JAMES J. MURPHY,
Stanford University

THE HUMANISM OF CICERO. By H. A. K. Hunt. Victoria: Melbourne University Press, 1954, and London and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1954; pp. viii+215. $4.50.

Ever since Cicero lived, students of Speech seem to have been reading and writing about his speeches, his rhetoric, and his politics; his philosophical works, of which he wrote a respectable number, have received less of our serious attention and interest. In this volume H. A. K. Hunt, M.A. (Oxon), Litt. D. (Melb.), Associate Professor of Classics, University of Melbourne, presents a study of all of his main philosophical works from the *Academica* to the *De Officiis*, in which he comes to the conclusion that, contrary to the commonly accepted view, there is "an orderly sequence in the series and a sustained argument." Cicero is revealed as the "chief source of information about the Hellenistic schools and the main Roman systematizer of their doctrines" who achieved for himself "a form of humanism unsurpassed in the pagan world." Accordingly, this study is of importance to all students of philosophy, and will be of

particular value to all students of speech who are interested in humanism, "a branch of philosophy whose importance is increasing in the modern world." If you have pondered the relationship of theories of rhetoric to epistemologies and have considered the humanistic potentialities of speech in our times, you will appreciate this book. As collateral reading for a course in the Roman tradition of rhetoric and public address, I consider it invaluable; the author's lucid analysis of the *Academica* alone, specifically his presentation of the conflicting theories of perception and probability as developed by the Stoics and the New Academy and synthesized by Cicero, is, in my opinion, worth many times the price of the book.

OTTO A. DIETER,
University of Illinois

LIBERTY AND REFORMATION IN THE PURITAN REVOLUTION. By William Haller. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955; pp. xv+410. $6.00.

There have been many studies in recent years of the persuasion of speakers, speeches, and speaking situations. There have been several investigations into the backgrounds for rhetorical phenomena. Still rarer is the book that analyzes and evaluates the oral and written persuasion used to forward a certain concept in an era (in this instance the concepts of liberty and reformation) in relationship to its total background. This not an easy task. It demands an author who knows thoroughly the history and literature of his period, the origin and development of the contemporary political and social ideas, the authors, speakers, and all molders of public opinion—their works, their aims, and their effects—an author in short who is a literary critic, an historian, a philosopher, and a rhetorician. While William Haller is primarily a Professor of English, his ability to understand, recreate, and evaluate the historical and draw significant inferences is evidenced brilliantly throughout this work. He is sufficiently acquainted and in sympathy with the rhetorical point of view to make this work one of interest and value to rhetoricians and teachers of speech generally.

Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution is primarily a contribution to the history of ideas. It is the history of the discussion which flowered when in 1640 all restraints on pulpit and press came suddenly to an end and preachers found themselves free as they had never been before to expound the Word. The author states the purpose of his book to be "to follow the argument . . . from situation to situation, crisis to crisis, in the revolution which began with the convening of Parliament in 1640 and came to its climax in 1649." The argument is followed in the sermon literature, the political tracts, and the parliamentary debates.

The pattern of argument that is revealed is complex and fascinating. It is threaded through one of the most exciting periods in English history for the rhetorician—The Puritan Revolution. The tracing of the several influences, the uncovering of the various lines of argument, the explanations of the strategies, the presentation of the arguments and counter-arguments from the initial calling of the assembly to the final overthrow of the king and his forces, make this an engrossing rhetorical history of the revolution.

There are several items in this work that demand special attention. Of interest to students of Milton is Professor Haller's scholarly analysis of his anti-prelatical and other tracts, his tracing of the Miltonic concepts in *Paradise Lost* to their original sources and of Milton's arguments from their inception to their final form. Of interest to seventeenth-century scholars is Professor Haller's illuminating discussion of marriage and divorce in the seventeenth century. General readers will enjoy the sharply focused word portraits of key figures who assume new significance in this work. There are studies of Walwyn, Overton, Hugh Peters, John Liliburne, and many others.

A few statements may need clarification. For instance to state that all ministers believed that through spiritual and temporal education and "commanding these arts" they "held the key and solution hereafter and to power here and now in church and state" may be a little misleading. William Perkins in his *Calling of the Ministrie* (1618) indicated that success in the ministry was due to the preacher being "inwardly taught by the spirit." Charles Chauncey clearly stated in his *Gods Mercy* (1655), "human instruction is not sufficient to make any man to be a Prophet." Several Puritan ministers, John Cotton and Thomas Hooker among them, believed that power in the pulpit was owing primarily to the apostolic nature of the preacher (many of the apostles were uneducated men) and the grace with which the preacher "perfumed" his office. While few ministers disparaged all temporary education, few held it to be the "key and solution." There were varying degrees of importance attached to it by the Puritan ministers.

Also it may be a little strong to state that the New England colony was "torn by heresy and schism from the moment of its founding." The early success and continued development of the theocracy is evidence that it was not too badly "torn." Heresies and schisms there were, but the ability to cope with them was there also.

The author's style is scholarly, lucid, exact, and can on occasions delight with originality. For example, one meets sentences such as these: "But as time was framed in eternity, so history must square with scriptures." "Thus the Haggais and Zechariahs of the Puritan brotherhood gained acknowledgment of the need for their services from the Nehemiahs and Zerubabbels of the Long Parliament." The author assumes that his readers are acquainted with the history of the period under discussion and he does not stop long to explain political events. Many of his quotations from Puritan writings may be almost like a foreign language to those who have not been introduced to seventeenth-century Puritanism. The clear organization, the orderly progression of ideas, and the well-conceived and well-balanced architecture of the whole work is a delight.

This book should be in the library of all those who teach or hope to teach British public address. It should be an example and inspiration to all scholars in rhetoric and public address who contemplate studies in this period, and it will provide stimulating and valuable reading for all students of argumentation and persuasion.

ROY F. HUDSON,
University of Wichita

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN THE UNITED STATES. By Richard Hofstader and Walter P. Metzger. New York: Columbia University Press; pp. 527. $5.50.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM IN OUR TIME. By Robert M. MacIver. New York: Columbia University Press; pp. 329. $4.00.

A few weeks ago American philanthropy made a gift of half a billion dollars to universities in the United States. The possible effects of such munificence upon the academic world will be an interesting one to ponder with the guidance (indispensable) of the three scholars whose work is under review here. When one recalls that the largest single donation to an American university before the Civil War was $50,000, the contrast emphasizes the importance of a review of policies and events intervening, together with prophecy on the future of freedom within the walls of universities and upon the larger national stage.

Sixty years have passed since Hastings Rashdall published his monumental history of European universities in the Middle Ages. During that period many studies of universities, their leaders, and the causes with which they have had connection have appeared. None of them, it is submitted, has been conceived and executed with greater ambition, brilliance, or timeliness than the combined work of these three Columbia historians who by their distinguished labors have earned place among Rashdall, Mallet, and D'Irsay. It is significant of the growth of the university as a corporate structure and its ties with industrial interests that these studies owe their existence to the American Academic Freedom Project supported by the Louis Rabinowitz Foundation. They are themselves prima facie evidence of the academic-economic alliance discussed with incisive vigor in the ninth chapter of the Hofstader-Metzger book.

This volume records, analyzes, and judges the development of academic freedom in the United States. By way of historical background, it touches upon Socrates, the "town-and-gown" battles of the Middle Ages, and enlarges upon the founding of Harvard and the beginning of an American tradition in 1636. It is a thesis of the authors that "academic freedom" means different things at different times. Hence, they record and comment upon many influences which have marked the modern university; the medieval university, the European, the early American, Darwin and science, the nineteenth-century German graduate program, sectarianism, and big business. In particular, the roles of the A. A. U. P., trustees, administrative officers, and faculties are dissected and evaluated. University teachers and students will be stimulated by the pages which discuss their personal and professional codes of utterance, their interests in the university community and in the city and state wherein they reside, the ethics of the classroom lecture, and standards for selection, promotion, and dismissal of professors. Shrewd comments are offered on the paradox of the relatively high social status of the professor and his insignificant monetary rewards.

The second volume, by the distinguished Lieber Professor Emeritus, discusses the status and future of academic freedom with special emphasis upon the present. What academic freedom is and its relation to constitutional freedom in the United States have been a long-

time concern of Professor MacIver. These pages reveal the extent of his analysis and the depth of his penetrating judgments. His examination of the assault upon these freedoms considers the particular avenues of the invasion: the special investigating committee, the denial of constitutional immunities, the effects of "smear" publicity, and the misuse of labels. Definition, analysis, and example are his major weapons. He has much that is enlightening to say on the ancient controversy of the main function of the university—whether it emphasizes pursuit or purveyance of knowledge; and the effect of each philosophy upon the progress or retreat of academic freedom. Mr. MacIver has tried with success to determine the place of the modern university and its function in our society, the influence of various types of university administrators upon the institutions they head, and, unexpectedly, the relation of teacher and student against the general background of civil and political as well as academic liberty.

These two volumes advance the general understanding of the meaning and function of the university to a degree that few others, if any, have achieved. Their pages are packed with knowledge both useful and ornamental. Their prose style is a reflection of the beauty and clarity which distinguishes the authors' judgment. In particular, the footnotes, especially of the first volume, are in themselves a liberal education. If there is a criticism of the two studies, it is based upon the reviewer's awareness of a large body of legal literature and ruling case law, intimately related to academic freedom in all its phases, which has not found adequate representation in the text nor in the footnotes.

GEORGE P. RICE, JR.,
Butler University

THE DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICAN LITERARY CRITICISM. By Harry H. Clark, Richard H. Fogle, Robert P. Falk, John H. Raleigh, and C. Hugh Holman. Edited by Floyd Stovall. Chapel Hill, N. C.: The University of North Carolina Press, 1955; pp. ix+262. $4.00.

The essays by several hands brought together in this volume were given in 1952 as addresses before the American Literature group of the Modern Language Association. The book is useful in opening up the subject of literary criticism in America from 1800 to the present, although the essays it includes are not detailed enough or profound enough to satisfy for long our need for a substantial survey of American criticism.

Floyd Stovall, the general editor, introduces the volume with a short note on criticism in America. Mr. Stovall does not discuss the collected papers—their materials, methods, assumptions, or objectives—other than to affirm that a genuinely American criticism has developed and deserves study.

In the first essay—a long one—on the criticism from 1800 to 1840, Harry H. Clark presents a systematic review of four decades in which the criticism was both unsystematic and, except towards the end, in the hands of minor practitioners. He traces out a number of trends, such as those towards individualism, intuition and imagination, hedonism, and organicism. Few scholars know much about American criticism during these years; most readers will, in consequence, find Mr. Clark's expert guidance helpful; but they will also find it difficult to puzzle their way through what is, despite its analytic divisions, a tangled essay, heavy with names and references.

Richard H. Fogle treats the years from 1840 to 1870, concentrating on the romantic theory of organic form. After examining briefly the critical positions of a small number of important periodicals, Mr. Fogle discusses the concepts of organic form and analyzes the merits and deficiencies of an imposing list of writers, among them Henry James, Emerson, Thoreau, Whitman, Poe, Hawthorne, and Melville. Mr. Fogle's comments are persuasive. One suspects, however, that the story as he tells it is incomplete, that the period is richer in varieties of critical outlook than he suggests.

Robert P. Falk argues that the historian of the years from 1870 to 1900 must not let disparaging epithets ("The Gilded Age," and a host of others) obscure the serious work of critics like James, Howell, and Lanier. During this age of realism, as it is ordinarily called, the several types of realism that existed showed the influence of romantic principles. Mr. Falk holds that this criticism represents a characteristically Victorian compromise, a synthesis of romantic and realistic principles. Realism as it develops through several phases is said roughly to parallel the social and intellectual movements of the times.

A chapter by John H. Raleigh on "Revolt and Revaluation" from 1900 to 1930 notes three overlapping movements during this confused, embattled period; increasing creativity and idealism ending with the first World War; an undercurrent of thought that depreciated

American culture; and the early, internationalist criticism of Eliot and Pound, emphasizing literary technique. This chapter gives considered treatment to the literature and the forces at work on literature but passes rather lightly over the analysis and assessment of the criticism.

In examining criticism since 1930, C. Hugh Holman records the movements "without attempting a serious evaluation of them." The wisdom (or ultimately the practicability) of avoiding critical judgment is questionable; but Mr. Holman does give us concise, sensible sketches of major schools and representative critics. It may be objected that he represents complex, dynamic movements as being simple and static, but limitations of space made this objection a difficult one to avoid. It may also be objected that he is unduly deferential in his attitude towards some very minor critics.

The volume ends with a select list of supplementary works on the history of literary criticism in America and with an index of proper names and titles.

GUY A. CARDWELL,
Washington University, St. Louis

ONE MIGHTY TORRENT: THE DRAMA OF BIOGRAPHY. By Edgar Johnson. New York: Macmillan Co., 1955; pp. 591. $6.50.

There has long been need for a good history of biography, for some study to give us more than Harold Nicolson's little book, *The Development of English Biography*, published in 1928, and perhaps not quite so much for the whole field as Donald A. Stauffer's scholarly study gives us for eighteenth-century biography in England. Unfortunately, there still is a need. *One Mighty Torrent* was not an adequate history of life-writing when it first appeared in 1937 and it is not now; it has not been changed at all since then and is, in fact, a reprint made from the original plates. The new preface uses reverence for the author's "former self" as an excuse for not undertaking the labor of writing a new and better book; consequently, the book is still a poor one and has had only the benefit of another proofreading.

Although Mr. Johnson announces his intention to clarify the principles of biography as a literary genre, there is little criticism and much paraphrasing and quoting. Obviously, there is not rigid policy to follow in the choice of biographers to be included in such a book, but for a study which purports to be a critical and historical interpretation of biography to leave out Margery Kempe in the Middle Ages and Lord David Cecil in the twentieth century is indicative of a lack of judgment, or at least of perspective, in the total view and evaluation of English life-writing.

Mr. Johnson restricts himself mainly to English biography, going from the Renaissance lives, like Cavendish's Wolsey, swiftly through seventeenth-century memoirs, diaries, and letters to the "Eighteenth Century Apogee" (Dr. Johnson)—with no mention of the highly significant Boswell Papers—and with a somewhat longer dwelling upon nineteenth-century figures, where Mr. Johnson (recent biographer of Dickens) is more at home. Finally, in a little section ironically titled "The Future of Biography" (written, I remind you, over eighteen years ago), all the references are now old and Mr. Johnson continues to ignore the profound influence of psychology on modern life-writing. He seems to be completely unaware of the fascinating concern modern biographers and autobiographers have for the creative process. He does make a guess—not so rash a look into the "future" even in 1937—that "Biographies will lean on the discoveries and methods of Freud, Jung, and Adler." In his maturity, Mr. Johnson has not considered it worth while to elaborate upon his earlier prognostication that "one tendency of biography in the future will be divergence."

It is to be regretted that Mr. Johnson did not bring out a new edition of another one of his earlier books, an anthology called *A Treasury of Biography*, instead of a new edition—a reprint, that is—of this book. In the former, a selection was made in undisguised form from some of the best English biographies. In the present book, the survey is weighted with an overwrought style. When I first read this book, many years ago, I thought the title described the style, and I still think so. It is, indeed, One Mighty Torrent.

DONALD J. WINSLOW,
Boston University

THE THEATRE ANNUAL, 1955. Edited by Blanche A. Corin. Vol. XIII. New York: Theatre Annual, Inc., 1955; pp. 89. $1.50.

The 1955 edition of *The Theatre Annual* offers us three rewarding historical studies, a director's account of his rehearsals for a seldom-seen Shakespearean play, and a plea for maintaining the playwright's freedom of expression.

In the leading piece, a rather puzzling and at times self-contradictory article entitled "Right to Dissent: Fear or Freedom for the

American Dramatist," John T. Dugan starts out to make the very good point that the playwright as artist must be protected from the pressure of having to conform to any doctrine. But by the time Mr. Dugan has finished asserting that artistic truth affirms the moral law, purges the intellect and the will of "despair and error," and demonstrates that "there *is* reason in the apparent madness of the world," he has, of course, enunciated a doctrine as restricting as any he protests against.

The true glory of the artists' work is the *uniqueness* of its outcome, not the ingenuity with which it demonstrates an acknowledged "Truth." The artist calls it as he sees it. His vision may or may not affirm the Ten Commandments or democratic society; it may find in despair and error its deepest revelations of the human condition; it may view the universe as a ghastly, senseless joke. Whatever the outcome, it can hardly be dictated. No, if the freedom we must secure for the artist is to mean anything, it must be a larger freedom than the one Mr. Dugan has in mind.

With delightful precision and felicity of diction James Sandoe records in "King Henry the Sixth Part II: Notes During Production" his agonies and joys in preparing this seldom-produced play for the Oregon Shakespearean Festival. In his discussion of the script's problems and challenges Mr. Sandoe does much to illuminate the dramatic values of the play which, he concludes, are strong enough to make the play eminently viable as a stage piece.

Rosemary Sprague contributes an article on "Hroswitha—Tenth Century Margaret Webster" that brings to life the remote nun whom scholars credit with writing the first plays in the Western world after the collapse of the Roman Empire. In addition to offering synopses of each of the plays Miss Sprague speculates interestingly on the parts played by Hroswitha's education and her proximity to the Court of Emperor Otto (with its Byzantine connections) in providing the impetus and inspiration for her work as a playwright.

From the depths of the British Museum come the Lincoln's Inn Fields Theatre account books which provide the material for Professor Emmet L. Avery's "The Finances of an Eighteenth-Century Theatre." Professor Avery's examination of the ledger for the season 1724-1725 helps us to see what a theatre's front-office operation was like over two centuries ago. We also learn, among other things, that actresses' salaries were far below those received by the actors and that more money per performer was paid to singers and dancers than to actors and actresses.

A particularly noteworthy addition to the history of the American theatre is the compilation by Albert E. Johnson and W. H. Crain, Jr. of "A Dictionary of American Drama Critics, 1850-1910" which *The Theatre Annual* provides in a detachable section. Rescued from oblivion are over 200 names which the authors have culled from journal, memoirs, and biographies of figures in the fields of theatre and journalism. An appeal to readers to send in newly uncovered entries might have been strengthened with an abbreviated listing according to geographical location. "Untapped" areas would then have been revealed at a glance.

HAROLD V. GOULD,
Randolph-Macon Woman's College

THE FLOWER IN DRAMA AND GLAMOUR: THEATRE ESSAYS AND CRITICISM. By Stark Young. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955; pp. xiv+223. $3.00.

Stark Young, always an advocate of "imaginative" theatre, has been described by Francis Fergusson as "perhaps the best theatre critic of our time" and by Harold Clurman as a person who "knows (that is, he really *sees*) acting." He was long a contributor to *Theatre Arts* and, except for the theatrical season of 1924-25 when he was drama critic for the *Times*, Young criticized stage productions for *The New Republic* from 1921 to 1947, occupying a post now held by Eric Bentley.

Young's *Immortal Shadows*, 1948, included a revised reprinting of some sixty-five reviews covering the years 1921-1946. In the present book, Young returns to the 1920's by reprinting essays that appeared in two earlier volumes.

Of the fifteen essays in *The Flower in Drama*, 1923, all except the "Letter to Duse" were revisions of magazine articles published during 1922, when Young was preoccupied with expounding his aesthetic theory. That theory is reflected, for example, in his comments on Seami Motokiyo and the Japanese Noh plays in which "objective realities . . . are turned into dreams, and dreams into reality." It was Seami, Young writes, who in acting

> taught his pupils that in imitation there should always be a tinge of the unlike. . . . If one aims at only the beautiful, the flower, as he calls it, will be sure to appear. . . . And if the flower be lacking there will be no beauty in the impersonation.

One must not imitate external manifestations, but must seek the "flower"—that is, seek the essence or heart of the matter, the dominant quality, the leading idea or point, "the essential characteristic that defines . . . the one art or piece of art . . . distinct from all others, but that at the same time establishes the relation of all things to the one."

Young's search in the theatre for the mystical "flower" and not for the "exact imitation" is marked in the other articles in *The Flower in Drama* on the acting of Chaplin, Eleonora Duse, Doris Keane, and others; on the Theatre Guild production of *He Who Gets Slapped;* and on the designs of Robert Edmond Jones. Eleven of these pieces, with minor revisions, are included in the new edition. Young's opinions haven't changed with the passing of thirty years. He still experiences with all instances of talent "a continual slight surprise . . . the mystery of what is alive. . . . There is always about a moment of fine acting a kind of fringe of wonder." His 1922 analysis of Chaplin's acting offers a marvelous summary of standards any "school" of acting could subscribe to: a finished technique; a unity of form and idea; precision and economy; a musical quality; invention; and vitality.

The fifteen essays in *Glamour,* 1925 (of which twelve are reprinted with a few changes in the revised edition), deal with Duse, Cécile Sorel, and the Moscow Art Theatre's performances in New York in 1923, "one of the landmarks in the history of our theatre." Young thinks the group failed with Alexis Tolstov, Gorki, and Goldoni, but succeeded brilliantly with Dostoevsky and Chekhov. (Since 1938 Young has admirably translated Chekhov's plays, published by Samuel French.)

In addition to other pieces on plays, acting, and directing, *Glamour* contains a group of imaginary "Letters from Dead Actors," in which Young contrasts the acting of Rachel with that of Pauline Lord (the heroic or classical vs. the realistic) and contrasts the acting of Garrick with that of Barrymore (the aristocratic and technical vs. the democratic and personal). But Young likens the acting of La Corallina to that of Doris Keane (witty comment to a cosmopolitan criticism of life).

The Flower in Drama and Glamour, 1955, is filled with Young's concern with the well-known duality or "double identity" of the actor (his imagined self and his real self). In fact, Young defines art itself as a blending of unreality or abstraction with reality, of dream or imagination with actuality, of generalization with fact, of "lustre and relief" with "nature." Reality translated into art must, Young insists, "have the charm of presence and absence, as Pascal said of portraits . . . it must be the same and not the same, like the moon in water, by a certain nameless difference born anew." It must have glamor, magic, wonder.

BEDFORD THURMAN,
Kent State University

THE TEMPEST. By William Shakespeare. Edited by Frank Kermode. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954; pp. lxxxviii+167. $3.50.

CYMBELINE. By William Shakespeare. Edited by J. M. Nosworthy. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955; pp. lxxxiv+224. $3.85.

KING JOHN. By William Shakespeare. Edited by E. A. J. Honigmann. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955; pp. lxxv+176. $3.85.

THE MERCHANT OF VENICE. By William Shakespeare. Edited by J. R. Brown. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955; pp. lviii+174. $3.25.

After nodding politely at nineteenth-century "allegory" criticism, Frank Kermode's *Tempest* Introduction passes quickly but thoroughly over what have become generally accepted matters of date, textual integrity, and themes. The editor then launches his own incisive views on source materials, which he considers collectively as manifesting ". . . the philosophical attitude of the Old World to the New, the attempt to read the natural life of the New World, and the morality of voyaging."

Under introductory sub-headings of "Nature," "Art," and "Art and Nature," Kermode incorporates with his own opinions both traditional critiques and recent treatises on primary issues. Caliban, in the editor's Art-Nature scheme, appears as "an extraordinarily powerful and comprehensive type of Nature: an inverted pastoral hero, against whom civility and the Art which improves Nature may be measured." Prospero, conversely, is "the representative of Art, as Caliban is of Nature."

Formal and stylistic considerations occupy succeeding sections of the new Introduction. Coleridge is here affirmed "possibly the best of all critics of this play;" and G. Wilson Knight's writings, in which "Tempest" is Shakespeare's symbol for high tragedy, music, for the quality of immortality," are noted in appre-

ciative summary. In concluding introductory remarks, Kermode cites Theodore Spencer as having confirmed that "there is a basic modern version of *The Tempest*," then asserts that "some critic will radically alter the assumptions upon which criticism . . . is at present founded."

The text comes almost straight from the First Folio, with variants treated in a comprehensive portion of ample appendices. Kermode's textual apparatus seems somewhat better managed than M. R. Ridley's recent Arden *Antony and Cleopatra*—since Kermode provides a thoroughly satisfactory reading, but deals authoritatively with other than textual matters, as well. He is modest and cautious, yet completely in control of the total editorial task.

J. M. Nosworthy's new *Cymbeline* brings Shakespeare's "romance," as the editor calls it, fully into the light of twentieth-century scholarship, restores the whole of the work to Shakespeare, and achieves a convincing definition of its genre. Granting its admitted defects, the play is no longer "a florid fairy-tale," as Henry James called it, nor Cymbeline "this witless savage . . . whose brains were ever in his consort's head," to quote Bernard Shaw's "refinished" version.

Out of impressive source studies (*Frederyke of Jennen*, advanced as the wager-plot source, and *Love and Fortune*, here explored at length), Nosworthy constructs a substantial bridge toward understanding this perplexing piece—"with all its absurdities, very entertaining" (Drs. Warburton and Johnson). Lest one suppose that *Cymbeline* is cut from the same bolt as *Philaster*, the editor states definitively, ". . . it is the outlook which dictates the method . . . and the romances of Beaumont and Fletcher . . . cannot have derived from any settled kind of attitude to life."

Nosworthy's method, based on a view of *Cymbeline* as "experimental romance," proves generally a sound one. Though separate details may seem momentarily at variance with one's attitude concerning *Cymbeline* as realized stagecraft, the editor's "romance" view points with extraordinary clarity to the core of *Cymbeline's* meaning as drama. Fantastic theatricality and patent artificiality, accordingly, are seen as geared to Shakespeare's "most complete and triumphant *vision* of unity."

Nosworthy, besides producing a splendid critical text, has taken a bold and independent stand on source problems and dramatic structure. His balance of passionate advocacy and cautious reservation yields a surprisingly consistent image of *Cymbeline* as both play and poem.

What probably should have come out separately, as a monograph, obtrudes itself in E. A. J. Honigmann's new *King John* so as to cripple the whole edition. This editor advances the hypothesis that the anonymous ten-act *Troublesome Raigne* is a "derivative play" rather than principal basis for *King John*. Thus, Holinshed ranks pre-eminent as source and Shakespeare's play is dated 1590-91. Honigmann's theory, which almost totally ignores Shakespeare's status as apprentice dramatist in a professional public theatre, extends itself throughout the *John* Introduction without managing any clear appreciation of the play as a work of art.

"The critics," writes the editor, "have been content to admire the few virtues in *John* not plundered directly from the *T. R.*" Though he promises subsequently to "re-examine it with new respect," Honigmann appears to drop the matter of thematic unity altogether, dodging the issue before ever allowing it to emerge. Image patterns are dutifully recorded, followed by a brief section on rhetoric. Then, Honigmann's *T. R.* frame of reference causes real difficulty, as *John* is at last treated as a stage play—inadequately. By a wilful extraction of speeches from context, the editor argues as though *John* were a moral tract, instead of a play. Attempts to discredit the views of others, concerning whether or not John is the hero, end by undermining Nosworthy's own tentative argument on the subject.

Though not likely to endear itself to even Shakespeare's most ardent adherents, this drama constitutes a significant landmark in the playwright's career and deserves more than the half-hearted tribute of a man bent on establishing a tenuous thesis concerning dating and source. Honigmann has put impressive energy behind *King John*, but he has pushed his edition in the direction of the library, not the theatre.

Excepting the matter of its textual apparatus which (in conformity with prevailing New Arden editorial practice) returns to an early printing, John Russell Brown's *Merchant of Venice* is not notable for achieved innovations. Though clearly set forth and consistently followed, the present format does rather little service to the play; indeed, Q1 punctuation often runs speeches on and on, breathlessly. Insistence by Brown that this edition probably was set from Shakespeare's manuscript may be sound enough; still, strict adherence to Q1 does not "nearly always result [in] good

dramatic sense," as the editor claims it does. Brown's introductory remarks consist largely of uncritical résumé of traditional scholarship; and when he does strike out on his own, the editor is sometimes ambiguous—and even guilty of distorting his facts. The bulk of the Introduction, regrettably, is marred by Victorian carpings on probability and decorum which do far less than justice to the play. Concerning the whole imbroglio of Portia's disguise, Brown writes, irritably: "Surely Shakespeare is at his most irresponsible and it is irrelevant to ask for themes or meanings. Fantasy and wilfulness continue to the end. . . . The play ends with a bawdy joke about the chastity of a waiting woman."

Surely it is the editor and not Shakespeare who is irresponsible; for *The Merchant of Venice* represents a great deal besides fantasy and wilfulness. It will probably outlive its present "autopsy" as well as all future attempts to make it conform to the exacting (if pedestrian) matrix of a detective story.

PAT M. RYAN, JR.,
Colorado School of Mines.

PRESENT DAY PSYCHOLOGY. Edited by A. A. Roback, with the Collaboration of Forty Experts in the Various Fields. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955; pp. xiv+995. $12.00.

This massive volume is of more than ordinary value to speech, perhaps, because the editor for many years has taught psychology in one of the leading private speech schools. The volume presents in a balanced and systematic manner the findings and interpretations of the various schools of thought in an area fraught with the utmost diversity. The topics (Pt. I) and branches treated (Pt. II) correspond to those emphasized in the psychology departments today all brought into one volume. Part III deals with dynamic and clinical psychology; Part IV with methods for research; Part V with psychological borderlands and humanistics.

Here are some of the most important chapters which bear more or less on the entire area of speech and communication: Recent Findings in General Neurology, by Joseph G. Keegan; Issues and Results in Sensory Psychology, by P. Ratoosh; Current Theoretical Approaches to Perception, by Paul Bakan; The Cognitive Processes, by Theodore F. Karwoski; Recent Views on Attention, and Trends in the Study of Memory, by William E. Galt; the Status of Emotion in Contemporary Psychology, by Madga Arnold; Psychodrama and Sociatry, by J. L. Moreno; Present Day Psychology of Speech, by Emil Fröeschels; Integrational Psychology, by Clarence Leuba; the Psychology of Art, by H. G. Schreckel; and by the editor himself, the Psychology of Literature, and the Present Status of Psycholinguistics.

The highlighting of current issues and points of controversy is emphasized in the treatment throughout. The present developments are summarized with sufficient clarity to permit the student to see the trends in the immediate future. Although there is a concern for semantics at some points, the work in general semantics, cybernetics, group dynamics, and communication theory are mentioned by a number of the authors, but without an awareness of the potential of these methodologies as central in the future structure of psychology as a body of scientific methodology.

Quoting the editor: "Practically in every psychology textbook, we find a paragraph or two on the psychology of language, but the information is so meagre, and the treatment so scant, that the student can scarcely imagine what a vast range the subject covers. There is no dearth of books on the psychology of language. They are mainly in German and French, and of ancient vintage. Time was when psychology and language were almost inseparable; and the philologists and linguists were hotly debating this or that issue with psychologists. A strange aloofness has come over the two sides, although through the increasing activity of semanticists, a rapproachment between the two is beginning to make itself felt." The treatment of Glossodynamics deals largely with words and less with larger language structures. He believes that no aspects of language usage can be understood without consideration of underlying motivations.

The relation between psychology and literature is only now coming to the fore according to Roback. "The artist is unfettered in his imagination. He knows that life does not proceed according to rules of logic. The psychologist, on the other hand, is always seeking laws, and where he cannot find them readily, as in the area of affections and motivation, he is apt to slight that whole range." In addition to the interpretation of the content from a psychological angle, there is the writer who needs analyzing, as well as the reader, the literary critic or reviewer, and even the publisher. Furthermore what in the personality determines a publisher or his reader to an

ticipate a large sale is a possible subject for investigation."

Art has been much neglected by psychology in the past according to H. G. Schreckel. But involved in and contributing to new contributions from interdisciplinary research will be a new psychology of art. We should inquire about the status personality as well as about the personal dynamics of an individual artist, and such inquiry should view the artist as participant in his society and culture.

ELWOOD MURRAY,
University of Denver

THE SANE SOCIETY. By Erich Fromm. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1955; pp. 370. $5.00.

Continuing where he left off in his now classic *Escape from Freedom*, Erich Fromm has here produced a masterful analysis of current democratic capitalism to go as a shelfmate to his earlier analysis of Naziism.

Fromm's first, and possibly most important, point is an attack on what he terms "sociological relativism," the assumption that the only criterion for social psychology is that of the culture. To replace this, Fromm suggests "normative humanism," a type of relativism with values related not only to culture but also to the basic nature of man and his environment. With this, Fromm does what most relativists believe cannot be done: evaluate an entire culture normatively. In doing this, Fromm suggests that it is possible for an entire society to be insane and, further, that this is precisely the condition of America today.

This startling claim becomes less strange as one follows Dr. Fromm through his analysis of "the alienated personality": the person who is alienated from himself, his life, and his society. Though these conclusions may be distasteful to some, the evidence presented is powerful. Fromm begins with the high murder-alcoholism-suicide rate in America and builds up to a devastating description of contemporary life: people buying only because of artificial "needs" created by advertising, deindividualizing pressures of "social conformity," and the general lack of genuine humanity and love that is more and more typical of American life.

The author's viewpoint, of course, is not unique; it shares much in common with Reisman's "other-directed man" and—as Fromm points out—with Huxley's *Brave New World*, which, incidentally, he postulates as more probable for America than the totalitarian bureaucracy of Orwell's *1984*. Throughout, Fromm echoes the growing uneasiness of many of America's social critics—among whom this author must rank high—concerning the "totalitarianism of mediocrity" and the lack of conviction, will, and self-directedness too often seen today.

Fromm's ideas prove far more controversial than the foregoing in his solution. Beginning with a provocative analysis of Marx and basic socialist doctrine—which, he states, are only partially economic—he builds a suggested program of "communitarian socialism—not to be confused with Communism, which ideology Fromm attacks bitterly. He contends that the reforms America needs *must* involve changes in economic, political, and social spheres *all together*, and that any "partial plan" affecting only one is bound to fail. His ideas are interesting—especially to those interested in communication—for they involve mostly the setting up of conditions of closer and freer communicative ties between men. He recommends the "sectioning" of industries into small groups, wherein workers could make the most of intimate, face-to-face activities and friendships. In politics, he suggests "Town Meeting" groups of about 500 persons to act regularly as "a true House of Commons involving all of the people."

Whether one accepts or rejects Erich Fromm's concepts, he will not forget them quickly. For any person in the field of Speech interested in problems of interpersonal communication and social psychology, this book is a "must."

DALE D. DRUM,
The Pennsylvania State University

SPEECH IN THE ELEMENTARY CLASSROOM. By Charles Van Riper and Katherine G. Butler. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955; pp. 150. $2.50.

An encouraging trend is occurring in elementary education and speech therapy. More and more teachers realize that speech must be taught in a more specific manner than that provided in language arts books. And speech therapists realize that speech training in the regular classroom can be a preventive factor as well as a necessary follow-up activity for children enrolled for speech therapy. Van Riper and Butler's new book makes a significant contribution to this trend.

The major emphasis in the book is on the improvement of articulation and on the development of emotional adjustment through

speech. Chapters on "Speech Improvement Time," "The Alphabet of Sound" and "Self-Hearing and Vocal Phonics," provide specific suggestions for teaching articulation of speech sounds. Other chapters include "Improving Fluency," "The Improvement of Voice," "Speech as a Safety Valve for the Emotions," and "Helping Children with Speech Defects in the Classroom." The Appendix includes "Typical Speech Improvement Lesson Plans."

The authors advocate a "speech improvement time" of approximately twenty to thirty minutes in length, once or twice weekly. One suggested lesson includes:

"Identifying individual speech sounds" (4 minutes)
"Vocal phonics" (6 minutes)
"Correcting mispronunciation" (4 minutes)
"Improving tongue coördinations" (6 minutes)

Another suggested lesson includes:

"Good vocal intensity control" (5 minutes)
"Good voice quality" (4 minutes)
"Fluency improvement" (6 minutes)
"Speech hygiene" (5 minutes)

Children are made aware of individual speech sounds through isolation and prolongation techniques. They are made aware of articulation errors which they or some other child might have. The speech improvement period is a definite time for speech instruction with little relationship to other subjects in the curriculum.

The authors report success in using the material in actual classroom situations. Classroom teachers using the material reported such things as "improved reading," "increase in volunteering" and "the children loved it."

The approach, however, differs from that used by this reviewer and many speech improvement teachers whose programs are known to him. Undoubtedly many classroom teachers and speech therapists will prefer a program which is more closely co-ordinated with other subjects in the curriculum, which they can include meaningfully in larger units of work, and which can be carried on in meaningful speech situations all day long every day in the week.

There will be many teachers of speech who will be concerned with the somewhat narrow approach to speech improvement. Many speech teachers are concerned with a tendency on the part of educators to limit speech instruction to work on voice and articulation, and to ignore such aspects as interpretation in oral reading and choral speaking, speech organization and composition, and group discussion techniques. This reviewer hopes that *Speech in the Elementary Classroom* does not reinforce a feeling, already too prevalent, that speech should be concerned only with the mechanics of voice and articulation, and that the teaching of speech does not include a concern for *what* is said, and how it is organized.

However, the teaching of speech has been left too long to classroom teachers who have neither the interest or ability to help children become effective, well-adjusted speakers. One of the strengths of this book is that it should do a great deal to prevent the development of maladjustments to everyday speaking situations. Classroom teachers who are sufficiently motivated to use the techniques presented by the authors should improve the mechanics of articulation in their pupils, be of invaluable assistance to the speech therapists, and develop improved emotional adjustment in speaking situations.

WILBERT PRONOVOST,
Boston University

HEARING THERAPY FOR CHILDREN. By Alice Streng, Waring J. Fitch, LeRoy D. Hedgecock, James W. Phillips, and James A. Carrell. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1955: pp. 371. $6.75.

This excellent book is practical, straightforward, informative, and pleasant to read. Those of us who teach survey courses in exceptional children to regular classroom teachers will refer students to it as basic reading in the area of the acoustically handicapped. Co-workers in allied professional fields will be rewarded quickly by reading the book as an introduction to the field of hearing-handicapped children. For student speech and hearing therapists, the book must be given high priority. Experienced therapists will find material excellent for refreshing soul-searching concerning their daily practices. Finally, the book is written so as to be understood easily by the average parent. It should have and deserves this wide audience.

Discussion of theoretical concepts and historical background is minimized; the undercurrent throughout is "practicability." Thus, six pages are given to historical review and thirteen to an introductory survey of the field. The twenty-seven pages allotted to the causes of hearing loss and their medical treatment present a clear and simplified discussion of the physics of sound, principles of audition, and the anatomy, physiology and most common disorders of the ear. Consideration of these

topics is not exhaustive but wholly adequate for a book which is purposely non-technical.

The section (62pp.) on the development, rationale and administration of diagnostic hearing tests, from tuning-forks to pure-tone audiometry and from group to galvanic skin-response testing, is as complete and lucid an account as one could find conveniently available in brief form anywhere in the literature.

A chapter on hearing aids for children (47 pp.) will prove most effective for parents, and for workers newly introduced to the field. By omission of the more technical aspects of hearing aids, the authors are able to give increased coverage to their primary concern, *viz.*, a brief overview of types of individual and group aids with increased stress on considerations and indications in the selection of hearing aids, and with major stress on the attitude and role of parents and teachers in helping children adjust to and use hearing aids most effectively.

However, the remaining portion (175 pp.), which considers educational needs and practices, particularly in relation to speech-reading, auditory training and speech/voice therapy, will serve as this book's main contribution. Following a general survey (21 pp.) of educational theory and practice applied in today's education of accoustically handicapped youngsters, there is concentration on the educational and social needs of children with mild and moderate hearing losses (50 pp.). The detailed and enlightened discussion of the role of the parents, regular class teachers and specialists is especially worthwhile. In addition to a review of all major speech-reading and auditory training approaches, readers will find a wealth of techniques and references to available materials. Rather than generalizing, the authors present techniques differentiated according to primary or intermediary grade levels and degree of hearing loss. Included are two highly detailed speech-reading/auditory training lessons which are most valuable. Speech therapy for defective articulation is dealt with only briefly.

The final chapter (101 pp.), called "The Education of Children with Severe and Profound Hearing Loss," is one of the best surveys available of current desirable practice in organized programs for the severely handicapped in the United States. In addition to unbiased coverage of best-known and recently developed educational and therapy approaches and materials (e.g., The Northampton Charts and the Tadoma or Vibration Method) specific techniques for speech-reading, auditory and voice training are given. Again, the detailed and practicable discussion of *usable techniques* in socialized settings is the important contribution. The section devoted specifically to language development and methods (34 pp.) is one of the better treatments of this too-neglected area of language theory and structure as related to hearing disorders.

Hearing Therapy For Children is strong evidence to support the assumption that multiple authorship can result in a book's having evenly distributed expertness while maintaining a consistent philosophy throughout. Although the purchase price may be a consideration, this book deserves a readily accessible spot in the bookshelf.

ALBERT MURPHY,
Boston University

LISTENING FOR SPEECH SOUNDS. By Empress Y. Zedler. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1955; pp. xi+145. $3.00.

There is much of merit and interest in this book. The author states that her primary purpose is "to provide the speech correctionist with practical material designed especially for the purpose of developing attentiveness to speech sounds on the part of young children"; also—"the purpose of the book is to offer material which can be used to equal advantage in both clinical and classroom situations." Its use is also seen by parents working with either professional group.

The book is divided into three parts. Part One is composed of three chapters: Purposes of the Tommy Stories, Fundamentals Underlying the Tommy Stories, and How to Present the Tommy Stories. Parts Two and Three include The Tommy Stories, Consonants and the Tommy Stories, and Vowels and Diphthongs.

Each story conforms to a definite pattern based upon certain concepts such as "the analysis of a sentence" as "a valuable method for correcting defects in articulation, spelling, or word recognition in reading"; speech as "a system of orally produced symbols called speech sounds"; reading and writing as "secondary forms of language development"; elementary teachers of reading and speech teachers of articulation as being "engaged in the same process; namely that of helping pupils attach meaning to symbols." These delightful stories with their charming illustrations stem from work done with and by second-grade children.

Especially in Chapter Two the author, speak-

ing with knowledge and authority in the field of speech correction and the field of reading, has given a significant view of joint responsibility for the child's language development. The author concludes that co-ordinated efforts would have a preventive as well as remedial effect in the young child's speech and in his reading readiness.

The preventive aspect of this conclusion is important and certainly of deep concern to the speech correctionist. However, the speech correctionist usually finds her program filled with the needs of somewhat older children whose difficulties have not been, and in some cases possibly could not have been, entirely preventive. Also the classroom teacher, whether working with the age group of reading readiness or beyond, finds her responsibilities including development of the child's skills in listening, speaking, reading, and writing. One might well ask if the major share of work with second-graders and hence greater use of this book should not be assumed by the classroom teacher well informed in basic speech needs. Both groups would do well to become acquainted with the material to be found in the second chapter and in the excellent reference list of this book.

The speech correctionist would be well advised to try in her work the method suggested for the stories with special attention to the author's advice to let the children make suggestions based on their own experiences. The correctionist may also feel secure in her recommendation of the book to the classroom teacher.

LAURA F. WRIGHT,
Alabama College for Women

THE ART OF COMMUNICATING. By Thomas Pollock, Marion Sheridan, Frances Ledbetter and Ronald Doll. New York: Macmillan Company, 1955; pp. ix+438. $2.88.

This book is one of the high school textbooks of the "English Series" sponsored by the Macmillan Company. It is designed as a "flexible tool" for both student and teacher of English.

As its title suggests, this volume is an approach to the study of English through the general communicative phases of reading, writing, speaking, and listening.

In their Introduction, the authors express the belief that whether the motivation comes from teacher, curriculum, or textbook, the teaching of English should never be "stereotyped" but should be determined by needs and interests of the students at a particular time.

The writers show their adherence to this belief in the plan of their textbook. Each chapter is regarded as complete in itself and yet there is continuity. In one instance the authors point out that theirs is a logical study plan in which odd numbered chapters deal with some "linguistic knowledge or technical skill" and are followed by even numbered chapters stressing the explained skill in the communicative situation. An example of this plan is indicated in Chapters Eleven and Twelve where basic sentence elements are analyzed in Chapter Eleven and where emphasis on sentence synthesis through composition and style is found in Chapter Twelve. A variation of the same procedure is found in Chapters Fifteen and Sixteen in which a study of the mechanics of composition is followed by directed attention to improvement of reading habits.

Another instance of the attempt of the authors to avoid the "stereotyped" is seen in the more than ordinary skill with which numerous pictures and sketches are blended with the ideas of each chapter. For the high school student, the colorful, pointed illustrations throughout the book serve not only as "attention-calling" devices but also as helpful aids to an understanding of chapter content.

Occasionally, sections such as Chapter Six, dealing with reasoning and argument, indicate a strong leaning of this book in the direction of a teacher's reference text. However, there is a bountiful and interesting number of exercises, practices, and tests in simple understandable language. And where the experienced high school teacher is aware both of the need of communicative tools on the part of the student and of the possibilities in the flexible plan of *The Art of Communicating*, the textbook deserves consideration as one which "teachers may use whenever the class or any of its members needs to study a particular phase of . . . English."

WILLIS N. PITTS, JR.,
Stoughton Public Schools, Massachusetts

SPEECH AND YOUR PERSONALITY. By Theodore F. Nelson and W. Kirtley Atkinson. Chicago: B. H. Sanborn & Company, 1955; pp. vii+454.

This volume is intended for use in the high schools, and suggestions are made (on page v) to indicate how it may suit the required course of one semester and the half-year or full-year fundamentals course.

There are four major divisions to the work: "Part One: Informal Speaking," "Part Two:

The Techniques of Speech," "Part Three: Platform Speaking," "Part Four: Special Forms of Speech." Each section is introduced by a suitable sketch, each of the fifteen chapters is headed by a drawing, and there are a dozen or so photographs. These last are perhaps the most valuable of the illustrations, showing speaking situations as actually handled by students and others. The drawing at the opening of Chapter Twelve (p. 315) is certainly poor; the student is shown supporting himself physically by very nearly wrapping himself about the lectern. He is reading his manuscript, which is held vertically before him so that the speaker can see scarcely any of his audience. It is to be hoped that the authors meant this as an example of improper form, though there is no evidence to support this idea.

The chapters begin with a selection of words to be used in vocabulary building; they end with review questions, projects, and materials for the study of grammar. In general, the subject matter is presented in a simple, clear, and interesting manner.

There is some question, however, as to the wisdom or value of including a chapter ("You Polish Your Manners") on the social graces. There are grammatical lapses, too, such as in the dangling modifier on page 261, line 3, and as in the section (p. 387) on "Reading Like You Speak." Again, the authors cannot distinguish between "uninterested" and "disinterested" (pages 227 and 332). The imaginary dentist quoted on page 7 uses "which" for "whom" (". . . patients on which to demonstrate his skill") and "until" instead of "before" ("I hadn't been here long until the nurse . . . invited me to speak").

These shortcomings notwithstanding, the volume is generally satisfactory.

THEODORE G. EHRSAM,
New York University

ORAL COMMUNICATION IN BUSINESS. By David C. Phillips. New York: The McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1955; pp. x+223. $3.75.

Oral Communication in Business is a textbook which is brief, closely knit, and pointed. A practical approach has been used. Phillips says in his preface that the book is "written in the hope that it may present some ideas that will assist" men in industry and the professions. Specifically, his purpose is to bring the "skill in dealing with people up to the level of our technical skills."

"The book is based on the premise that the basic principles of oral communication are the same in all situations." Moreover, it is pointed out that the "use of basic principles may vary from occasion to occasion, but the first step in becoming a good communicator is to master these principles."

The author discussed many ideas in the book with men in industry and business. He indicates that the late Professor J. P. Ryan, an academic teacher of men from business and the professions, was his greatest influence. Phillips also acknowledges assistance from his colleagues in the "communication field." A number of illustrations are taken from personal observations of speakers in action. Model speeches and various classical and modern references provide additional examples. This whole background has made for a sound approach.

The first seven chapters are devoted to some of the fundamentals ordinarily found in our public speaking textbooks. These divisions of thought are entitled: A Point of View, Know Your Listeners, How To Organize Your Oral Communication, How to make Oral Communication Interesting, How To Prove A Point, Sound Plus Sight and Your Physical and Vocal Delivery. The succeeding seven chapters are appropriately directed to business and professional speech. They are described by these chapter headings: Conference Procedure, Leading a Conference, The Sales Presentation, The Interview, Occasional Speeches, Speaking on Radio and Television, and Conducting a Meeting.

The special emphasis placed upon listening and the visual aids is commendable. Herein the author makes a plea for speeches more carefully designed to fit the needs and interests of the audience. This theme reveals itself again and again in the treatise.

Another feature is the section which pertains to conferences, interviews, sales presentations, and meetings. These chapters have a noticeable quantity of common sense information for a variety of professional speaking occasions.

The compressed handling of such essentials as vocal and physical delivery into a single, relatively short chapter might be insufficient instruction for the beginning professional speaker. Many students in adult classes have difficulty in delivering the message.

Since attention is being focussed on increased employee participation in institutional affairs, information could have been developed on such matters as group dynamics. In that case, discussion 66, case studies, role playing and other similar forms should have been considered.

Professional people would profit by the rules Phillips has set down. If so, many more effective meetings, interviews and conferences would be assured.

MILTON J. WIKSELL,
Indiana University

HOW TO WIN THE CONFERENCE. By William D. Ellis and Frank Siedel. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1955; pp. x+214. $3.95.

Discussion-is-all-cooperation enthusiasts and footnotes-and-research-findings scholars will see little value in this breezy volume whose book jacket proclaims that conferences are contests and offers to "turn your imagination to profit." Speech people have, however, long labored the point with which the book begins: that the best of engineering or business talents may be nullified by lack of skill in conference. To be successful, ideas must be accepted by those in a position to adopt or reject. Establishing this point by repeated illustration, the authors—both prolific writers for radio and other media—discuss such conference skills as preparation ("If we had to choose between too little preparation or too much, we would a thousand times prefer the former"), timing, wording, ideas, using humor ("You can't laugh and be mad at the same time, even in a conference"), yielding a point, saving face for other participants.

This book has many limitations. It is not so much superficial (indeed, Ellis and Siedel popularize such sound rhetorical principles as studying one's opponents and determining one's objectives beforehand) as incomplete. Choice, use, and presentation of evidence receive only incidental attention. Analysis of a problem-situation, arrangement of ideas, and the steps of group thinking are not mentioned. Important conference skills are neglected.

But the value of the book, especially for those of us professionally interested in discussion processes and group methods, is not in its generalizations but in its wealth of illustration and anecdote. Examples involve industrial managers and union negotiators, mostly anonymous but including such names as Ben Fairless, Alfred Perlman, August Swift, and John Patterson. The book makes easy reading and will be a useful reference on conference speaking and group discussion in industry.

GREGG PHIFER,
Florida State University

THE STAFF ROLE IN MANAGEMENT. By Robert C. Sampson. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955; pp. xii+226. $4.00.

Staff specialists in industry, according to Consultant Sampson, stand today at the crossroads. "They can go on as they have been doing and make only a small part of their total contribution. Or they can reorganize themselves and their thinking for a creative staff role. . . . They can try to be the masters of management. Or they can view themselves as developers of management." It is, of course, the latter, in each case, which the writer recommends.

This clear and urgent call for the staff specialist to revise his approach to his work so as to produce *creative* results for management is a valuable addition to the very small library having to do with the problems of staff and line relationships in business and industry.

The problem which Sampson poses in this search for the meaning and purpose of staff work is that of providing a systematic point of view about staff work, a view which will provide a simple way of uniting staff skills with those of line executives to work together for improvement. The answer provided by the author, a management consultant and former director of Staff Services for a large railroad, is this simple thesis: "executives can profit most from help in solving their problems, using the resources within the organization itself."

The management executive, we are told, tends to depend too much upon *techniques* to do his work for him, techniques which are likely to be rigid and inflexible, and "unhuman." And it is the current role of the staff expert to work out these techniques. This, at present, is his primary function. This limited view of the possible contributions of the staff expert comprise the fetters which Sampson here attempts to break. The new role of the staff specialist will be to do what he is *not* now doing: "helping executives in *their* solutions to *their* problems in *their* work situations." (Italics his.)

The basic thesis of the book is this: instead of being content to have his staff specialist or consultant work out slick and parsimonious *techniques* in methods, costs, wages, training, labor and human relations, communications, and the like, the modern executive should see his staff specialist in this more creative role, that of staff counselor, the man with the facts, the data, the background, and the counseling skill, who will help the executive to solve his own problems himself, and thus assist him in becoming able to solve his own problems *himself* in the future. It is as simple—and as complex—as that.

Part One of *The Staff Role in Management*, called "The Tyranny of Techniques," examines the present situation and states its problems. Part Two, "Staff Objectives," deals with the purposes and goals for which the staff specialist should strive; Part Three, "Staff Work in Action," sets forth the methods to be used in consulting with and assisting the line executive; and Part Four, "The Future," predicts what can be done by application of these principles.

Sampson's plea for a creative role for the staff specialist is directly in the tradition of the best writing for modern management. It is based upon the recurrent thesis of human relations that problems which one man "solves" for another are not solved at all, that every man and every group can only be assisted or guided toward his or their *own* solutions, that one man's solution is another man's mess.

ROBERT C. MARTIN,
Lake Forest College

GROUP-CENTERED LEADERSHIP. By Thomas Gordon. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1955; pp. 366. $5.00.

In the last decade we have seen the emergence of many new areas of specialization within the behavioral sciences. Basic textbooks in psychology and sociology now make frequent references to "group dynamics," "communication theory," "non-directive psychotherapy," and "general semantics." The task of assimilating these new movements into traditional social theory has been speeded by the occasional publication of what can best be described as works of translation; books which interpret or apply the new theories so that they may enrich and be incorporated into the doctrine of related specialties. *Group-Centered Leadership* is such a book. It is the first serious attempt to apply the lessons of non-directive counseling to the problems of group leadership and to education generally. If for no other reason than this, it merits careful study.

Essentially this book is an appeal for a new pattern of leadership in the committee, the classroom, and the community. Against a background of experience with client-centered therapy, Gordon and his associates attempted to design a training program in group leadership. Out of the practical decisions required by this undertaking came an examination of the theoretical rationale underlying leadership and training for leadership. Each of the three sections into which the book is divided touches upon a different facet of their problem. Part One examines the foundations of current thought about leadership and presents a philosophy "that puts human values first, a leadership that facilitates man's realization of his creative capacities, man's free expression of his individuality, man's actualization of his own uniqueness." Part Two contains a description and an assessment of the staff's experience in planning and conducting a workshop on a non-directive basis. Data are provided to chart the reactions of staff members and delegates as they participate. Part Three is a case study of group-centered leadership in a manufacturing company. This takes the reader full circle. What was originally conceived to be a therapeutic technique becomes a philosophy of leadership, an educational method, and emerges finally as a *modus operandi* for all human relationships.

Those thoroughly familiar with the literature of psychotherapy or leadership will find occasion to differ with the author. It will shock many to hear group dynamicists criticized for neglecting the leader in their research, overlooking the problem of dependence in their training, and emphasizing the intellectual over the emotional aspect of learning. Those who like their semantics straight will question dichotomizing something as varied and complex as the nature of man. It is unfortunate that the three-part division which strengthens the book as a general introduction to non-directive leadership should make it incomplete as a text on leadership, as a treatise on training, and as a guide to industrial supervision. And there are many places which suggest that non-directive leading and teaching must be experienced to be learned; that reading about them is only a beginning.

But an occasional bit of dust should not obscure the view. This book is clearly and interestingly written, original and challenging in its conception, profusely illustrated and documented. It would be easy to recommend a book of this type to teachers of discussion and speech therapists and let it go at that; but it would be doing the general reader a disservice not to urge him to give this book his attention if he is seriously interested in improving his teaching or in living more richly with others.

DEAN C. BARNLUND,
Northwestern University

SPIRITUAL VALUES IN SHAKESPEARE. By Ernest Marshall Howse. New York: Abingdon Press, 1955; pp. 148. $2.50.

The strange combination of good literary

criticism and poor homiletics is found in this book by the minister of Bloor Street United Church of Toronto, Canada. Eight plays of Shakespeare are discussed under these headings: "*Hamlet*—The Tragedy of Indecision," "*Othello*—The Tragedy of Jealousy," "*Macbeth*—The Tragedy of Ambition," "*King Lear*—The Tragedy of Ingratitude," "*Richard the Third*—The Tradegy of Bad Intention," "*Julius Caesar*—The Tragedy of Good Intention," "*The Merchant of Venice*—The Tragedy of Inhumanity," "*The Tempest*—The Tragedy of Life."

How these chapters are to be taken is not entirely clear. Are they basically sermons, lectures, or essays? This much the author tells us: his frequent use of literature in the pulpit brought requests for him to deal with Shakespeare; two series of sermons were prepared, and these "form the basis" of the chapters in this book.

Dr. Howse sketches with real artistry the main features of each play and highlights the issues. He is steeped in both the literature *of* and *about* Shakespeare. But when he moves from literary foundations to moral implications he loses perspective, Shakespeare becomes simply grist for the homiletic mill and is used much as the Bible is commonly used—to prove or illustrate anything the preacher has in mind.

Moreover, each play is treated in its entirety under a single theme, as indicated in the listings above. But either one limits oneself to the aspects of a play which focus upon a single theme or one has a mixture of themes—the inevitable consequence of drawing out everything a play has to say. There can be no objection to discursiveness—if it is freely chosen—but titles should fit. Another question arises, however. Even if Howse has limited himself to the materials which bear upon his titles, do his titles reflect genuine themes of the plays?

Certainly "The Tragedy of Good Intention" can be found in *Julius Caesar*. Brutus betrays Caesar with high idealism but is caught in other currents and the larger good is swallowed up by a larger evil. Good intention is not enough. Howse makes the most of it. But how different is his attempt to find in *Othello* "The Tragedy of Jealousy." Othello *is* jealous, but he is also trusting. He is noble and base and strong and weak—a bundle of contradictions. So too Hamlet. To call his tragedy "indecision" is to say nothing, for his indecision is but the symptom of something which goes much deeper. In *Macbeth* the issues again are not so simple as Howse would have us believe. Evil desires are there, but fate (the witches) are cast alongside human responsibility (a tortured conscience). This is tragedy of web-like complexity, not the simple "tragedy of ambition" in Howse's moralizing. Neither can the tragedy in *King Lear* be caught by the over-simplified notion of "ingratitude."

The other plays (with the exception of *Richard the Third*) are handled differently, but the basic criticism is the same. The deeps of Shakespeare have been run off into homiletic shallows. This is remarkable since, as suggested earlier, Howse suffers from no lack of vision when he is not "preaching." With evident irony we quote him against himself: "In all his plays Shakespeare was a dramatist and not a moralist"; "With him every moral issue is complex and cloudy, because life is complex and cloudy."

E. Winston Jones,
Boston University

SENT FORTH TO PREACH. Studies in Apostolic Preaching. By Jesse Burton Weatherspoon. New York: Harpers and Brothers, 1954; pp. 182. $2.50.

Dr. Jesse Burton Weatherspoon has been Professor of Preaching in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky, since 1929. He is widely known as the reviser of John A. Broadus' "Preparation and Delivery of Sermons."

Sent Forth to Preach incorporates the substance of four lectures which the author delivered on the Holland Foundation at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary of Fort Worth, Texas.

Sent Forth to Preach is concisely described by its subtitle, "Studies in Apostolic Preaching." The book is divided into seven brief, informative chapters: (1) "Apostles of Christ," (2) "The Dynamic of Preaching," (3)"The Nature of Preaching," (4) "The Word of the Gospel," (5) "Making Disciples," (6) "Building Up the Church," and (7) "Tests of the Road."

Dr. Weatherspoon makes a detailed examination of the character of Apostolic preaching in the hope that he might strengthen the kinship of the modern preacher to those "sent forth" in the first century. In the chapters of his book, the author states the significance of Christ's calling of the twelve disciples and of the names he chose for them, reviews the preparation of the Apostles for their ministry, and discusses seven of the words commonly used to describe apostolic preaching. He also sets forth the message of preaching as a revelation

from God and good news to a lost world, collects from the sermons of the Acts ideas about the preaching of primitive Christianity that have suggestive value for today, and examines the teaching mission of preaching as contained in the Gospels and the Epistles. In addition, the author tries to point out some of the problems and perils of the preacher as he declares the Christian message in a difficult and sometimes hostile world.

According to Dr. Weatherspoon, the task of preaching is to herald the good news of God. The good news must be related to the times at hand. Unless the preacher has a living experience of God, he will have nothing important to say. Preaching should be "as personal as private conversation." The preacher is a man with a supreme experience to tell. Even though he may speak to multitudes, he must talk to people in "face-to-face, direct-personal speech." Although times have changed, the basic needs of individuals have not changed. Preachers of today are to proclaim the same Jesus Christ of the apostles. Contemporary proclamations need what the apostles had—a profound experience of God's salvation, the power of the Holy Spirit, a knowledge of their listeners and of how to communicate with them, and a desire to preach no matter what the cost.

Sent Forth to Preach is worth reading—many of its pages are worth underlining. It is an admirable job of analysis. It will fan the growing flame of more Biblical preaching. It seems a little repetitious and wordy but the division of material is generally well done. Its Biblical and evangelical emphasis produce much warmth and light.

EDMUND H. LINN,
Andover Newton Theological School

BRIEFLY NOTED

PRINCIPLES AND TYPES OF SPEECH. By Alan H. Monroe. (Fourth edition.) New York: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1955; pp. xxiv+680. $4.50.

WORKING FOR MORE EFFECTIVE SPEECH: Speech Projects to Accompany *Principles and Types of Speech* and *Principles of Speech*. By Harvey Cromwell, with the editorial collaboration of Alan H. Monroe. New York: Scott, Foresman and Comany, 1955; pp. 110. $1.00.

When a textbook reaches its fourth edition, there is no reason to comment on the philosophy, basic approach, or distinguishing features. *Principles and Types of Speech*, in twenty years, has already attained a position of prominence. The important thing is to consider the differences between the third and fourth editions.

In basic structure, the two editions are practically identical. The same thirty-three chapters are divided into six parts, instead of the introduction and five parts of the Third Edition. Page numbers correspond exactly for the major part of the book and any slight variation is due to changes in illustrations. There are some minor substitutions of one word for another, but they do not alter the meaning.

Changes have been made which bring the book up-to-date and make it more attractive to the reader. Where excerpts of speeches are used as examples of certain principles, some of the older speeches have been replaced by ones made during the period from 1953 to 1955. This use of more recent material permits the application of speech to current problems and introduces contemporary speakers. The lists of "Speeches For Collateral Study" have been revised. Most of the pictures are new and they are used quite effectively.

A new feature is the "Student's Reference Manual" which is designed to supplement material introduced in the body of the text. In these sixteen pages at the back of the book there are interesting lists of overworked and multiple-meaning words, trite expressions, cliches, slang, "big words," and loaded words. The section on "A Guide To Effective Listening" points out some of the special problems involved and suggests ways in which principles which have been presented can be applied in improving the listening ability of the student. The brief explanation of the various kinds of visual aids and advice on their proper use should be helpful.

Dr. Monroe states in the Foreword of *Working For More Effective Speech* that it is "designed for use with either *Principles and Types of Speech*, fourth edition, or the briefer edition, *Principles of Speech*. It contains a series of projects to help students apply, through performing carefully outlined tasks, the principles explained in their basic textbook." It might be used equally well with the Third Edition.

The thirty-eight projects provide a wide range of assignments which cover such categories as: determining speech needs and abilities; improving delivery; understanding the audience; building the speech; listening effectively; basic types of speech; special types of speech; and

group discussion. The Appendix includes speech proficiency profiles, the International Phonetic Alphabet, a word list for one of the projects, and student speeches.

Each subject is introduced by two or three paragraphs of explanatory material and then the student is referred to specific pages in the textbook. The assignments which follow are quite definite and leave little room for the excuse of failure to understand. Space is provided for student oultines, evaluation by the instructor, and suggestions for improvement, whenever the assignment requires a platform appearance. All of the pages are perforated so that they may be removed easily.

The instructor who is searching for a variety of challenging assignments will find the workbook quite helpful.

WOFFORD G. GARDNER,
University of Maine

COMMUNICATIVE SPEECH. By. R. T. Oliver, D. C. Dickey, and H. P. Zelko. Rev. and Enlarged ed., New York: Dryden Press, 1955; pp. 386. $3.60.

College teachers of public address will readily recognize both title and authors of this text, for it represents the expansion and revision of a well-received 1949 work. Basics, in terms of standards, delivery problems, and listening, and developmental materials on preparation, purpose, organization and visual aids make up the first two units. Forms of communication, which treats informative, persuasive, and entertaining speeches, together with discussion, parliamentary law, conference, and interviews comprise the third section. A chapter on responsibility for further growth rounds out the second half.

The central theme is expressed in the Preface as an effort to present speech education as the ". . . centralizing focus of a liberal and humane preparation for fruitful living and effective citizenship." Student readers will find themselves given a broad perspective on the nature and role of communication, a commonsense introduction to idea development and management, and a succinct exposition of the major speech situations. Classical rhetoric, social psychology, the authors' considerable personal experience, and a wealth of historic and contemporary reference add both stature and practicability to this volume.

Because of the difficulties which attend any attempt to compress so large and complex a subject area, certain omissions and simplifications are present. The "speech personality" approach of Elwood Murray, and the contributions of Hayakawa and Lee on the semantics of communication do not appear, nor do specimen speeches, and the sections on parliamentary procedure and discussion touch only lightly on important principles and techniques. However, in a first course text, it is often the wiser decision to make the material more compact and assimilable, thereby encouraging student understanding and application.

The format is excellent. There is good illustration, copious use of section and paragraph titles, and ample detail in both Table of Contents and Index. The use of off-white tinted paper noticeably reduces reading glare, and each chapter closes with exercises and writing or speaking projects. Since the book is arranged in sequential yet unitary form, it lends itself to either a one or two semester course, and the writing style is crisp, lucid, and highly appropriate. In this reviewer's opinion, *Communicative Speech* ranks high among the most useful textbooks our profession has yet produced.

ARTHUR EISENSTADT,
Division of Special Education
Newark, N. J.

EFFECTIVE SPEAKING IN BUSINESS. By Alfred D. Huston and Robert A. Sandberg, revised by Jack Mills. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955; pp. 329. $6.35.

The tremendous growth of adult education in recent years and the corresponding growth of interest in adult speech courses makes noteworthy the appearance of another text which draws heavily on business sources for its doctrine and illustrations and which is written in the language of the businessman.

In preparing this revision of the 1943 *Everyday Business Speech* by Huston and Sandberg, Mills added a section on parliamentary procedure with a simplified table of motions, brightened the text by the addition of a number of photographs and drawings, and has included some well-chosen examples of recent business speeches together with such old stand-bys as Bruce Barton's "Which Knew not Joseph."

The authors take the position that "students who gained some effectiveness as conference speakers invariably could prepare and deliver effective public speeches with a minimum of instruction." The organization of the text reflects this position. Chapters Four through Eight deal with the various aspects of conference speaking; Chapters Nine and Ten deal

with sales and the job application interview; the concluding three chapters deal with the public speech; and the Appendix is devoted to parliamentary procedure.

Following in the vein of Sarett and Foster (*Basic Principles of Speech*, New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., Rev. Ed. 1946) the authors have revised Quintilian's "good man" concept and have presented the ideal of the "able man." Their definition of the "able man," however, is based on Hoopingarner's *Personality and Business Ability Analysis* (New York: A. W. Shaw Co., 1927) and the constituents include: impressiveness, observation, initiative, thoroughness, decision, adaptation, organizing ability, concentration, and constructive imagination.

As the organization of the text proceeds from the informal to the formal the first speaking situation considered is that of conversation. In the third chapter rules are presented for the "game of conversation" which, the authors maintain, will promote success. The rules are: 1) ask questions, 2) use common ground, 3) observe the one-minute rule, 4) be a good listener, 5) be complimentary, 6) don't argue, and 7) don't hit below the belt.

The five chapters devoted to conference speaking treat the conference as a situation involving conversation or either expository or persuasive speaking. The group discussion methods which are applicable to so many conference situations are only briefly suggested.

Chapter Seven deals with persuasion in the conference. The treatment of evidence and reasoning are suggested only in passing. The use of motivation through appeals to ten basic desires is briefly treated in the same chapter.

Chapter Ten deals with the application interview and presents a number of helpful suggestions on the techniques of job finding including company analysis, job analysis, application letters, data sheets, and other material not usually found in the standard speech text.

The ease of reading, the practical business approach, and the simplified rules suggested for many speech situations will make this text attractive to those who are seeking a quick and practical rather than a more detailed and theoretical approach to effective speaking.

AUSTIN J. FREELEY,
Boston University

THE YEAR'S WORK IN MODERN LANGUAGE STUDIES. Edited for the Modern Humanities Research Association by S. C. Aston. Volume XV. Cambridge, England: The Cambridge University Press, 1955: pp. viii+492. $8.50.

Although this series of bibliographical studies long has been a prime reference for scholars in modern literatures, some of the topics included will direct the researcher in the field of Speech to current articles of value to him and yet unlikely to be noticed in the bibliographies he ordinarily will investigate.

Unfortunately, the arrangement of the material is more convenient for the historical literary critic than for the scholar in Speech. The main sections are devoted to medieval Latin studies, French and Provençal studies, Hispanic studies, Italian studies, German, Scandinavian languages, and Slavonic languages.

But a little searching will reveal references to excellent articles in at least three areas of relevant interest: rhetoric, theater, and phonetics. The medieval Latin section, for instance, calls attention to the rhetorical work of a neglected scholar discussed in the article, "Les Manuscrits autographes de deux oeuvres de Lorenzo Guglielmo Traversagni imprimés chez Caxton." Other references are in the section on Italian medieval literature.

The student of theater who is at all interested in comparative and historical outlooks will find numerous references in most of the sections, especially in those treating French and Spanish drama. The student will find helpful the fact that many references are annotated with brief but pointed critical comment so that he need not always trouble himself to procure every article on his subject.

While many of the books and articles on phonetics referred to in the studies deal particularly with one language, the phonetician will find valuable quite a few articles such as "Perception syllabique et perception musicale dans la phrase chantée," listed in the section on French phonetics as appearing in *Journal de Psychologie normale et pathologique*.

HAROLD B. ALLEN,
University of Minnesota

FIFTY YEARS OF CLASSICAL SCHOLARSHIP. Edited by Maurice Platnauer. New York: Oxford, 1954; pp. xiii+431. $5.00.

Studies in Drama, Oratory, and Rhetoric of the classical period for the past half-century are summarized in this volume. The book is divided into fourteen chapters, each written by a different British or Scottish scholar; each of the chapters presents a brief summary of scholarship in one field since 1900, plus a bibliography of the field for that period.

Greek Tragedy and Comedy are handled by T. B. L. Webster and K. J. Dover respectively. Webster lists approximately 130 bibliographical citations for Tragedy, while Dover's treatment of Comedy lists almost 200 such entries. Roman Drama is written by W. A. Laidlaw, and includes some 150 citations.

Greek Orators and Rhetoric are discussed by H. Ll. Hudson-Williams, who refers to 132 publications. S. F. Bonner treats the subject of Roman Oratory (including Rhetoric), noting 213 contributions on this subject.

Other chapters present discussions of poetry, philosophy, history, and Homer.

The summaries for each subject are generally quite clear, providing both a general survey of trends and some indication of individual theories. Nevertheless, the most valuable sections of the book will be the bibliographies of books and articles for each subject.

Two noteworthy omissions in the chapter on Roman Oratory, however, may give some reason for believing that the bibliographies are not up to date as of 1954 (which is the publishing date, timed to coincide with the 50th anniversary of the Classical Association). Not included are the important Harry Caplan translation and edition of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (Loeb Library, 1954), and Charles Edgar Little's *Quintilian the Schoolmaster* (Nashville, Tenn.: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1951).

JAMES J. MURPHY,
Stanford University

BIBLIOGRAPHY ON HEARING. Prepared by The Psycho-Acoustic Laboratory, Harvard University, S. S. Stevens, Director, J. G. C. Loring, Compiler, Dorothy Cohen, Technical Editor. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955; pp. 599. $7.00.

This is an enlargement of the *Bibliography on Audition* published in 1950. While the complete listing of over 10,000 titles is arranged alphabetically by author, the titles are cross-referenced under the major headings of Anatomical, Biophysics, Biochemistry and Pharmacology, Psychophysics, Animal Studies, Speech and Information, Music, Noise, Effects of Sound on Man, Deafness, Audiometry, and Auditory Theory. Foreign as well as American references are included. This excellent comprehensive bibliography will be extremely valuable to students, therapists, and researchers in the field of speech and hearing.

WILBERT PRONOVOST,
Boston University

ARE YOU A GOOD LISTENER? By Harold P. Zelko. New London, Connecticut: The National Foreman's Institute, Inc., 1955; pp. 21. $.25.

Designed primarily for readers on the management level of industry, this small pamphlet offers a concise explanation of the listening process and its function as a phase of the larger problem of communication in industry. "Ten Basic Rules of Listening" and a "Listener's Check-List" are provided. The style is clear and direct, and the illustrations attractive.

LELAND M. GRIFFIN,
Boston University

HOW TO SELL AND UNSELL IDEAS. By Fred DeArmond. Chicago: Lloyd R. Wolfe, 1954; pp. xi+237. $7.50.

This book might be subtitled, *The Strategy of Winning an Argument*. The preface states the purpose of the book "is to help the reader to hold up his side in the many arguments that are an inevitable part of . . . life." "Defensive tactics [are] given even more attention than offensive, because it is presumed that most readers are not of the temperament to relish starting a controversy." Mr. DeArmond reminds his readers, however, that "the best defense is a hard-hitting offense."

Most of the nineteen chapters are neatly subdivided in many sections, and each point is developed by one or more stories or examples. The book is replete with incidents, and often the only development of a point is as a story or illustration. The narrative approach makes for easy reading.

The usual principles of argument found in standard texts, such as evidence and reasoning, are mentioned in the book but are discussed only briefly. The beginning student of argument upon reading this text might well become more involved in strategy than in basic principles of argument and persuasion. The student schooled in the principles of argument might read with interest some portions of the book concerning strategy.

Each chapter of the book closes with "In Capsule" statements concerning ideas discussed in the chapter. The last chapter is composed of twenty-eight "Selected Maxims for Winning an Argument."

DAVID C. PHILLIPS,
University of Connecticut

PUBLIC RELATIONS IN EDUCATION: A TEXTBOOK FOR TEACHERS. By Clifford Lee Brownell, Leo Gans and Tufie Z. Maroon. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1955; pp. 249. $4.50.

Public relations is the art of influencing individuals or groups to adopt an attitude or pursue a course of action. It has been said that this also is a valid working definition for education, and certainly the task of the teacher is in many aspects a public-relations job.

"Public Relations for Teachers" reaches beyond the teacher-student relationship and in the main takes as its target public the taxpayers. As a textbook for training teachers in the techniques of publicizing the good works of the school system, it is excellent.

To help clear up foggy conceptions in the minds of many educators the authors even find it necessary to explain at length that public relations is respectable. They might well have added that it is just as respectable as, and not more so, than the cause in which it is employed.

One piece of exceptionally wise advice is given to the teacher called upon to make an oral report: state in one sentence just what the report is about. The chapter on "Speaking and Understanding" is a simply-expressed plea for better presentations before audiences, with very practical directions.

Here and there in the book appear sound bits of soul-searching, such as: teachers should realize that television cannot be dismissed with the same type of clever quip that failed years ago against radio. Before attempting to influence the attitudes of others, educators obviously should survey their own.

The concept of the educators as a group isolated from and insulated against contact with the rest of the community doesn't hold water these days. We shall never successfully influence others if we are not reasonably amenable to change in our own sets of opinions. This book therefore has a two-way purpose: to show new teachers how to open their own minds as they go about opening the minds of others.

HOWARD STEPHENSON,
Boston University

YOUR VOICE IS YOU. By Myrtle H. Cannon. New York: Exposition Press, 1955; pp. 47. $2.50.

This book, dedicated to Mae Albers and devoted to an exposition of "the Albers method of voice training," strikes a nostalgic note. The day of the Great Teacher who invented and perfected "A Method" has given way to the impersonal approach to speech teaching which stresses the accuracy of the scientific laws upon which certain activities and procedures are based.

I have no doubt Miss Albers was a dynamic teacher who helped her students to develop better voices. No one can quarrel with the idea that good posture frees the vocal mechanism for good voice quality. It is indubitable that the vowels carry the tone in speaking. Stressing the vowels and touching the consonants lightly should produce a legato, resonant quality.

However, the fact is that many of Mrs. Cannon's statements are contradicted by evidence obtained through stroboscopic photography and similar objective investigation. While the purpose of teaching phonetics is not, primarily, to develop good voice, I think most people will not agree with the scathing statement that "Phonetics, as anyone who has reflected upon it with an open mind well knows, is a dead end."

The use of the words "explosion" and "hit" to describe the action of outgoing breath upon the vocal cords during phonation may well produce a "glottal stroke." This has brought the disaster of nodules to many a singer, trained in the so-called "French" school of the *coup de glottis*.

In short, although Mrs. Cannon's sincerity is appealing and her "psychic images" may produce good tone in her own students, her book is not a safe guide for an inexperienced voice teacher.

LETITIA RAUBICHECK,
Board of Education, New York City

CHORAL SPEAKING IS FUN. By Letitia Raubicheck. New York: Noble and Noble, 1955; pp. 44. $.75.

HOLIDAY BOOK FOR VERSE CHOIRS. By Gertrude Dixon Enfield. Magnolia, Massachusetts: Expression Company, 1954; pp. 96. $1.50.

These two books on choral speaking are welcome additions to the field. Each is written and arranged for younger children with a special emphasis on presentation, rather than on group reading as a technique used for improving speech.

Each author has included excellent directions for presentation of the material. These directions are not inflexible and can be varied by the teacher to suit the needs of a particular group.

Holiday Book for Verse Choirs is intended to supply directors with material for specific holi-

days. These holiday plays are for (1) New Year's, (2) Twelfth Night, (3) Lincoln's Birthday, (4) Washington's Birthday, (5) May Day, (6) Halloween, (7) Thanksgiving, (8) Christmas Miming, (9) Christmas Eve, and (10) Christmas Fun.

Only the Christmas Eve play is intended for High School; the others can be used in Junior High or even with younger children.

Choral Speaking is Fun is the first book of a trilogy. Book One is intended for boys and girls in the second and third grades. The twenty-six poems have been carefully selected and arranged.

The author has given a short discussion on how to teach choral speaking, so that any classroom teacher will be able to present an effective choral speaking program.

JOHNNYE AKIN,
University of Denver

THE INITIAL INTERVIEW IN PSYCHIATRIC PRACTICE. By Merton Gill, Richard Newman, and Fredrick C. Redlich. New York: International Universities Press, Inc., 1954; pp. 423, plus two, 12-inch LP phonograph records, optional. $6.00.

For those interested in interviewing techniques, especially those in the clinical situation, this book-record combination provides one of the most interesting and valuable sources currently available. Not a text, the book, in addition to a short introduction on principles of interviewing, reports verbatim three initial interviews, together with candid comments on the proceedings by the authors. The phonograph recordings which accompany the book are actual recordings of the same three interviews; they are moderately well recorded, but regardless of quality are fascinating and valuable. The interviews are as follows: 1) a neurotic woman, interviewed by a professional psychiatrist, 2) a neurotic man, interviewed by a young medical student without training in interviewing; and 3) a psychotic woman, interviewed by a professional. The vividness and realism of this treatment is such as provide the student-interviewer with information it is doubtful he could receive in any other way.

DALE D. DRUM,
The Pennsylvania State University

POEMS OF BEN JONSON. Edited by George Burke Johnston. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955; pp. liv+353. $8.75.

George Burke Johnston, an American Jonsonian already distinguished by *Ben Jonson: Poet* (Columbia University Press), has edited a splendid new text, substantially complete, of the poems of the immortal Ben.

As Johnston points out in his introduction, such adjectives as the "inevitable *rare*," *rugged*, *solid*, *colossal*, *learned*, *classical*, and even *great*, "used by men not given to indiscriminate praise," have not won a large reading public for Jonson. The monumental Herford and Simpson Oxford edition of the poet's works, completed only recently, though a wonderful service to scholars, is not likely to attract many *new* readers. Johnston's new volume, then, modestly priced, of convenient size, and with a modernized text, ought to help gain a wider audience for Jonson than he has hitherto enjoyed.

Johnston is, of course, greatly in the debt of the Oxford edition. But, whereas this multivolumed library was designed for reference and not for pleasure, the new Harvard text employs modern type forms for the letters *s*, *i*, *j*, *u*, and *v*; places its critical notes together at the rear of the volume; and eliminates the Latin poems, as of scant interest to today's reader. To the complete *Epigrammes*, *Forrest*, and *Under-Wood*, Johnston has added, among the Miscellany, many of the most popular songs from Jonson's plays and masques.

PAT M. RYAN, JR.,
Colorado School of Mines

JAPANESE NOH PLAYS: HOW TO SEE THEM. By Toyoichiro Nogami. Tokyo: Nogaki-Shorin Publishers, 1954; pp. 73. $2.00.

For those uninitiated into the exquisite beauty of Noh drama the late Toyoichiro Nogami's slim but lovely book will serve as a delightful introduction to the rich rewards that await the serious student of Noh. The long, tedious recitals associated with Noh itself are refreshingly absent in this volume. On each page is at least one sharply detailed plate illustrating the author's brief but highly selective commentary on the most essential aspects of Noh drama. There are forty-one plates in all, so arranged that the reader has the feeling of actually seeing a Noh play.

The book's subtitle "How to See Them" is most accurate, as the primary emphasis of the work is slanted toward enriching the reader's understanding and appreciation of what he might see if he attended a Noh play. With the aid of this beautifully put together book with its carefully chosen and illuminating plates, any interested reader would be able, without further assistance, to view a Noh play in Tokyo

or wherever else he might be fortunate enough to see one, with sufficient understanding to follow the production intelligently and appreciatively.

The teacher of drama will find this work an invaluable aid in introducing Noh to students. The theatre itself, production of the plays, masks and costumes, are covered with a thoroughness that is nothing short of amazing for so brief a work. This book might well stimulate students to further study of Noh who would otherwise discourage and abandon interest in so difficult and intricate an art form.

MARGARET C. YOUNG,
Devereux Schools, Devon, Pennsylvania

THE DRAMATIC STORY OF THE THEATRE. By Dorothy and Joseph Samachson. New York: Abelard-Schuman, Inc., 1955; pp. 168. $4.00.

Dorothy and Joseph Samachson, authors of *Let's Meet the Ballet* and *Let's Meet the Theatre,* have written another book especially designed for the theatre lover.

To the playgoer who enjoys the theatre, and wonders about the origin and development of current productions, these authors present theatre history in an entertaining manner. Fifty illustrations, ranging from excellent reproductions of old plates and sketches of the ancient theatre to photographs of current Broadway actors and plays, exemplify the dramatic growth of the theatre.

The general style of presentation of each phase of history is well handled by the device of making the reader feel as if he were a member of the audience watching the presentation of the best drama of the times. The methods of staging, acting, and of the authors represented are given from the earliest Egyptian and Greek times to the present day. Vivid pictures stimulate the imagination of the reader and should inspire him to further study.

This book will find its place in introductory courses for drama students, and in drama study programs for community theatre and club groups who wish to increase their appreciation of the theatre.

The theatre historian and scholar will be interested in noting how much vital material has been condensed in this small book and how delightfully and accurately it has been presented.

VIO MAE POWELL,
Idaho State College

BOOKS RECEIVED

ON THE NATURE OF MAN. By Dagobert D. Runes. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956; pp. 105. $3.00.

THE GIFT OF LANGUAGE. By Margaret Schlauch. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1955; pp. viii+342. $1.75.

DANTON'S INFERNO. By Danton Walker. New York: The Hastings House, 1955; pp. xxxvii+312. $3.95.

INTERPRETING LITERATURE. By K. L. Knickerbocker and H. Willard Reninger. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1955; pp. xiv+850. $5.50.

THE GOSPEL WITCH. (The Poet's Theatre Series, Two). By Lyon Phelps. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1955; pp. 94. $2.75.

EXPLORING POETRY. By Louis Macha and Arthur J. M. Smith. New York: Macmillan Company, 1955; pp. 799. $4.50.

THE POETS LAUREATE. By Kenneth Hopkins. New York: Library Publishers, 1955; pp. 295. $4.75.

GREAT MODERN SHORT STORIES. Edited by Bennett A. Cerf. New York: Modern Library, 1942; pp. 488. $ .95.

SEVEN FAMOUS GREEK PLAYS. Edited by Whitney J. Oates and Eugene G. O'Neill, Jr. New York: Modern Library, 1950; pp. 471. $ .95.

THE LATE VICTORIANS. By Herman Ausubel. New York: Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1955; pp. 188. $1.25.

WALT WHITMAN'S POEMS: SELECTIONS WITH CRITICAL AIDS. By Gay W. Allen and Charles T. Davis. New York: New York University Press, 1955; pp. 280. $3.75.

PREREQUISITES OF GOOD TEACHING, AND OTHER ESSAYS. By Ernest Sachs. Hamden, Connecticut: Shoe String Press, 1954; pp. 118. $2.50.

"WELL SAID!" BENEDICTE'S SCRAPBOOK. Compiled by William B. Gamble. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company; pp. 252. $3.95.

SHOP TALK

LOREN REID, *Editor*

THE LOS ANGELES convention will go down in the records as one of the highly successful annual meetings. On the scholarly side our scouts report that the editors of our publications spotted several papers that will later appear in print. On the constitutional side our scouts declare that the old Executive Council was interred in stately fashion with just the appropriate quantity of wistfulness and tears; Lester Thonssen took the gavel from Thomas Rousse with the proper mixture of humility and enthusiasm.

On the fabulous side—our scouts continue—the convention ranks alongside of the Salt Lake City meeting of 1947. Although Los Angeles could not produce the *Messiah* sung in full splendor at a Tabernacle, it outdid itself with Ginger Rogers, Agnes Moorhead, and Dr. Frank C. Baxter. What they contributed comes under the three-way heading of interest, inspiration, and entertainment—and we select those words carefully from our large stock. The convention dinner, attended by 452 people, with another 75 or more turned away, was in itself a spectacular. Verna Breinholt's committee of sixty decorated the tables like a MGM musical, complete with star-spangled candles, pottery favors, and free Sunmaid raisins. Father Gilbert V. Hartke, president of AETA, introduced a table-full of Hollywood stars, directors, and producers so graciously and wittily it is hard to see how the presiding could have been done any other way. There was also a telegram, from President Dwight D. Eisenhower, who assured us, as did the Hollywood people, that what we did was vital and important. Our scouts also attended the TV stations and the great motion picture studios; a typical group visiting one of the latter saw Jimmy Stewart do a scene for *The Spirit of St. Louis,* his new show (advt.); and afterwards had a nice visit with him.

Our thanks go to the industrious and inventive local committee, headed by Milton Dickens, James Klain, and John Wright, and their many, many co-workers, who held regular meetings throughout 1955 getting ready for our coming. And since some 1250 persons registered at the central desk at Hotel Statler headquarters, even the Finance Committee can lay down its worries.

FROM NOW ON you will read much about Interest Groups, about twenty of which were approved during the convention. Each group presented a petition signed by 100 bonafide SAA members, was granted permission to organize, and has been entered on the official roster of the Association. From now on the Interest Groups will work with the successive First Vice-Presidents in the planning of convention programs.

The historically-minded Executive Council of 1955, last of a long and distinguished line of Executive Councils, noted formally that at 9:43 p.m., Tuesday, December 27, 1955, the first Interest Group was approved. This distinctive position goes to the group on Parliamentary Procedure, in whose behalf Joseph F. O'Brien, of Pennsylvania State University, appeared before the Council. Undoubtedly this

group will open up a broad new field of study and research: it plans to consider not only the technical aspects of parliamentary rules, but legal, political, and rhetorical implications. One of the papers presented at Los Angeles, for example, was entitled "Modern Lessons in Parliamentary Procedure from the Athenian Ecclesia," read by Alan Nichols of the University of Southern California.

Another Interest Group, one that already has considerable experience in planning convention programs, is the one on Interpretation. Garff B. Wilson, of the University of California at Berkeley, appeared before the Council in behalf of this group and told about its purposes and plans. Recently the Interpretation people sponsored the publication in various speech journals of four research papers in this field, had a supply of extra reprints struck off, and bound them under the title of *Symposium in Interpretation.*

Much more could be said about Interest Groups, but this brief note will remind the reader who did not attend the Los Angeles convention that he will have an opportunity to affiliate with one or more of them.

IN A PUNGENT PIECE bespeaking wisdom and statesmanship, the December Shop Talk spelled out the colossal task that would confront the 1955 Nominating Committee. Delving into statistics, this department reported that 282 names would need to be recommended to fill the various positions called for by the new constitution.

The wisdom of the membership elected Jeffery Auer, Waldo Braden, and Evelyn Konigsberg; the statesmanship of the Council added Horace Rahskopf and Karl Wallace; and this committee of five immediately went into action to fill the vacant posts. They completed their task during the convention, spending 27 hours at the job. Dozens of names were suggested to them by a variety of sources, including state and regional associations; each name of course had to be checked against SAA records to establish membership. You will find their report elsewhere in this issue and in *The Speech Teacher.*

SPECIAL HEADLINES: Donald C. Bryant of Washington University is the newly-elected editor of *QJS.* Howard Gilkinson of the University of Minnesota is the newly-elected editor of *Monographs.* They take office in 1957. When Waldo Braden's term as Executive Secretary expires July 1, 1957, his successor will be Owen Peterson, also of Louisiana State University, to continue in office for the usual term or until the Association can find a permanent headquarters.

THE SPEECH ASSOCIATION of America enjoyed an income of $54,425.22 during the fiscal year ending last July 1, according to the report of the Association's auditors. It enjoyed expenses of $52,994.11 during the same period, the auditors continue, leaving an operating surplus of $1,431.11, or about 2.6 per cent. The Association has therefore done pretty well over the years; the report nine years ago showed income of a trifling $20,703.34, with expenses some two hundred dollars greater.

That report of nine years ago showed the net worth of the Association to be $10,755.69, including cash on hand, bonds, old *Journals,* office equipment, and office supplies. By 1952 that figure had grown to $30,215.02; and last year was $39,854.88. In 1915 *Speech Monographs* was a research annual of 128 pages; now it comes out four times a year. The *Directory* then listed members only by name and address; now it is a small-scale biographical dictionary. The *Speech Teacher* issued its first number in 1952. In 1944 the placement service announced 121 vacancies; in 1946, 389; in 1947, 344; now its volume of business is half again larger than any previous figure.

We face many problems as we enter 1956, but we can certainly look back with pride upon all these achievements.

FOR THE FIRST TIME EVER, SAA is to have a summer convention. The 1957 annual meeting is scheduled for Boston, August 25-28. Far-sighted planners may begin to think about their vacation for next year, presumably combining their professional interests with a visit to old, cultural, historic Boston (Bunker Hill, Faneuil Hall, Old North Church, Goodspeed's Book Store) and environs (Harvard University,

Emerson's home, House of Seven Gables, Women of Marblehead), and points north (Vermont, Maine, Gaspé Peninsula—no passports needed). Shop Talk hopes that the idea of an August convention is so successful that the membership of the Association will review once again the arguments for holding the annual meeting at some time other than the Christmas holidays. The 1956 convention will be held, however, at the traditional time—December 27, 28, and 29, at the Conrad Hilton, Chicago.

BOOKS IN PRINT are the special prerogative of the *New Books in Review* department, our neighbor to the west. But Shop Talk has learned about several books-in-being, not text books, that are worth reporting.

An Index to the Quarterly Journal of Speech is to appear on or about April 1, according to William C. Brown Company, publishers, Dubuque, Iowa. This index, compiled by Giles W. Gray of Louisiana State University, will contain exactly 20,962 entries, with an abundance of references and cross-references. For many years the Executive Council discussed ways and means of publishing this comprehensive work, and finally turned it over to a commercial publisher under an arrangement agreeable to all concerned. The editor of Shop Talk long ago inspected the index file, from which the publication is to be compiled, in Dr. Gray's office at Baton Rouge, and found it to be a work of the utmost usefulness.

The manuscript for *Daniel Webster and the Salem Murder*, by Howard Bradley and James A. Winans, has been completed and is in the hands of Artcraft Press, publishers of this *Journal*, at Columbia, Missouri. It is a study of the White murder case. Shop Talk was intrigued by it sufficiently to write Professor Winans for information. "This is not a book to glorify Daniel Webster," he replied. "We wish the reader to know what is back of the speech which we have all praised to the skies." Professor Winans goes on in his letter to indicate a few of the factors that underlie the speech, all of which arouse this prospective reader's curiosity.

Three volumes of studies sponsored by project committees of the Association are also in progress. The volume of studies of public address on the antislavery and disunion issue has reached the point where the committee is seeking a publisher. The committee sponsoring the volume of studies in the colonial period of American public address has assigned authors to each of the proposed chapters, as has the committee sponsoring the volume on southern oratory. The committee on the history of speech education is interesting itself in the possibilities of a biographical dictionary. Two volumes of studies honoring distinguished teachers of speech are also well under way, headed up by scholars from Cornell and Iowa respectively. You may be able to see one new volume of studies each year from now on out.

How successful have these cooperative volumes proved to be? The Executive Council paused a moment in its deliberations to look over the product of past years. The prime example is the *History and Criticism of American Public Address*, published in two volumes in 1943 at $10.00. Two thousand sets have now been sold; the publisher's supply is exhausted. The going price for second-hand sets, when they can be found, is $35 to $40. Seven hundred and seventy-two copies of *A History of Speech Education*, published in 1954, have already been sold. Better buy an extra copy, and hold for the rise. And while you are at it, order a complete set of *The Speech Teacher* (4 volumes, 16 issues, $1.00 per issue).

CONFERENCE CALENDAR

Washington State Speech Association, Benjamin Franklin Hotel, Seattle, April 20-21. Program chairman, James Starr, Wenatchee Valley College.

Fourteenth Delaware Play Festival, University of Delaware, March 20-21. Communications should be addressed to the Dramatic Center, C. Robert Kase, Director, University of Delaware, Newark.

Fifth Western Laboratory in Group Development, August 19-31. For information write Department of Conferences and Special Activities, University Extension, University of California, Los Angeles 24.

Delta Sigma Rho Forensic Conference, University of Wisconsin, March 9-10. Fiftieth Anniversary Jubilee of Delta Sigma Rho, April 12-14, Hotel Sherman, Chicago.

Eleventh Radio and Television Conference, March 10, Michigan State University, East Lansing. Robert P. Crawford, director of radio-television education at Michigan State, is in charge.

Special Education Conference, University of Missouri, June 21 and 22. Lectures and discussion groups on such problems as those of

the speech handicapped, the deaf and hard of of hearing, the gifted, and the orthopedically handicapped. For information write the College of education or the Adult Education and Extension Service, University of Missouri, joint sponsors of the conference.

THE FOLLOWING memorial resolution was adopted by the Faculty of Purdue University on November 22, 1955:

Paul Emerson Lull, Professor of Speech, who died August 6, 1955, will be remembered for his high ethical and academic standards, his driving energy, and the very wide range of his interests. During his twenty-nine years at Purdue he became nationally known as a leader in his primary field of discussion and public address, while at the same time devoting endless time and energy to such diverse projects as community dramatics, life insurance marketing, campus tours, football, boys' work, instrumental music, and gardening. (One of his associates has remarked that wherever he went in the community, Professor Lull was there, had just left, or was expected soon to come.) He was an inquisitive scholar and a rigorous teacher, but he never lived in an ivory tower. Above all, he was intensely personal in everything he did; people were always more important than the positions they held; students were individuals to know as well as to teach; nearly everyone who knew him called him by his first name or initials; and at all times he maintained a deep interest in his home and family.

Professor Lull was born in Sayre, Pennsylvania, on July 8, 1903. He became interested in speech and the social sciences as an undergraduate at Albion College where he was a member of the debating team. After graduating with the A.B. degree he taught speech and history for a year at Eaton Rapids (Michigan) High School and in 1926 accepted an appointment as instructor of speech at Purdue University, where he became an assistant professor in 1930, associate professor in 1940, and professor in 1946. In the meantime, he had received the M.A. degree from the University of Michigan in 1929, and the Ph.D. from the University of Wisconsin in 1939. In 1951, the degree of Doctor of Literature was conferred on him by Lincoln Memorial University.

His professional interest centered in the processes of discussion and public address. At Purdue, he personally coached the debating teams for many years and later acted as Director of Forensics. He inaugurated the Indiana High School Debaters Conference and Legislative Assembly which for over twenty years has attracted a thousand young men and women to Purdue and has twice received citations from the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge for outstanding merit in citizenship training. He was active in the Western Conference Debating League, was chairman of the Committee on Debate and Discussion of the Speech Association of America and for several years was national president of Tau Kappa Alpha, honorary forensic society, later being appointed to the membership committee of the Association of College Honor Societies. In all these activities he became known for his insistance on the speaker's responsibility for logical analysis and ethical purpose; he was a sharp critic of demagoguery, opportunism, and shallow logic disguised by name-calling and partisan emotional appeal. This philosophy is markedly revealed in his published articles appearing in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, of which he was an Associate Editor for three years, in the *Speaker*, *Speech Monographs*, and the *Journal of Communication*, as well as in occasional articles in trade and industrial journals.

In his later years he became intensely interested in the role of oral communication in business and industrial life. Called on to lecture before such Purdue conferences as the Pest Control Operators conference, the Indiana Restaurant Association conference, the Lumber Yard Manufacturers meeting, and the conference of C.I.O. Educational Directors, he became impressed with the need to study the communication processes used in day-to-day business affairs. This research, in which he had already directed half-a-dozen young men through their Ph.D. studies, had developed to the point of attracting national attention when his career came to an end.

Outside his primary professional field, perhaps his greatest interest was in the theatre. He was one of the charter members of the Lafayette Little Theatre, acted in and directed many of its plays, and for many years was chairman of the board of directors. He directed a number of student plays at Purdue and for a short time was acting director of Purdue Playshop. Together with H. Kenn Carmichael, he helped to produce—and in one instance wrote the music for—a series of children's plays presented in the Mars Theatre for the Lafayette elementary schools.

He was almost equally interested in music,

being himself a skilled pianist and organist, and a composer of considerable merit. His young friends enjoyed the ease with which he grasped the latest musical fad and his readiness to join them in popular music; but his older friends were struck with the delicacy and strength with which he played the classics. He was a member of the board of the Lafayette Symphony Association and was active in his support of young people's musical activities.

Most of all, he liked working with people. This characteristic, coupled with his strong sense of civic responsibility, led him to engage in a wide range of community activities. He belonged to the Lafayette Lodge of the B.P.O.E. and was chairman of its scholarship committee. He was a member of Central Presbyterian church and active in it. He was a member of Tau Kappa Epsilon and for a time was faculty adviser of the Purdue chapter. He was active in P.T.A., West Lafayette High School Athletic Boosters Club, and Boy Scout work.

During World War II he served as captain in the Army Air Corps, having enlisted because of his strong sense of duty, despite a physical disability.

The faculty of Purdue University has lost a strong and many-sided man.—R. A. Cordell, L. S. Winch, A. H. Monroe

---

ON THE LIST of those who like simple language, add the name of Ethel Merman. In *Who Could Ask for Anything More* she writes: "Following the first night of 'Anything Goes' " the *New York Herald Tribune* printed a thing I couldn't understand. It went like this: 'Miss Merman's part of the song goes along bars, so to say, while the orchestra indulges in contrapuntal ripples and waves which have nothing to do with the tune, and meanwhile also the rhymes themselves fall on first and middle syllables, in a delightfully tricky sort of syncopation which calls for the most delicately accurate timing on the part of all concerned. The dash and precision with which Miss Merman lands each syllable where it belongs is enchanting.'

"What I finally figured the man must have meant is this: it was a very tricked-up orchestration and the band was playing against me, but I came out ahead. Period."

THE 1956 CONFERENCE of the Central States Speech Association will be held at the Hotel Sherman in Chicago on Friday and Saturday, April 6 and 7.

In planning the convention an effort has been made to formulate sectional programs which will appeal to all teachers of speech no matter what their special interests may be. Sectional meetings have been organized with the elementary and high school teacher in mind, as well as the college and university professor of speech.

The programs will fall into the ten major areas of speech and hearing, theatre arts, speech in the elementary school, interpretation, communication, public address, radio and television, ministerial training in speech, forensics, and speech in the secondary school.

OF MANY SPECIAL meetings held last fall, Shop Talk has received notes on the breakfast meeting of the Colorado Speech and Hearing Association on October 28; the 1955 Conference on Communication in Business, held on the Kent State University campus, November 22; the annual meeting of the Virginia Speech and Drama Association, held in Richmond October 28; the annual meeting of the Speech Association of Missouri, held in St. Louis November 4; the annual meeting of the Louisiana Speech Association, held in Alexandria November 22; the 28th annual Indiana High School Debaters' conference and 13th annual Indiana Student Legislative assembly at Purdue, December 2 and 3.

THE FIRST ARTICLE in the present issue has already attracted some attention. John Crowe Ransom, critic and poet, read it in manuscript and volunteered a comment which we are glad to have the opportunity to publish. Says Mr. Ransom: "I am delighted with this essay by Mrs. Bennett, who assumes the oral approach to the poem—and any critic must be aware of the extreme importance of that neglected kind of interest—and then goes on in one object-lesson to compound with it the other knowledge of the poem too. It seems to me altogether possible that the oral agents who work at the presentation of poetry, if they follow her cue, might be the first to render it completely. And that would be momentous."

BOSTON UNIVERSITY and the New England Council have started production on a new series of broadcasts about New England business and industry, to be called, "The New England Adventure." The programs feature the stories of thirteen or more New England companies in dramatic documentary form. Designed as a public service, the series will present a

biography of New England's economy, dealing with the history of each company, its place in the community, its problems, and its plans for the future. Companies with suitable stories to tell have been invited to participate. Creating the programs are Sidney A. Dimond, of the Communication Arts Division of the School of Public Relations and Communications, and George W. Sloan, Jr., faculty manager of Boston University's radio station. This team has won several awards from the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge and the Ohio State Broadcasting Institute for previous documentary programs about New England life.

RONALD MITCHELL, University of Wisconsin Theatre Director, offered the following definition of a "theatre person" in a recent speech:

"What distinguishes theatre people from all others? The uncharitable would point at the unbalanced, insincere creatures who run about in unusual costumes calling everybody "Darling!," whether they know him or not, and who contrive to look thirty years younger in the spotlight than in daylight, if indeed they ever see daylight, keeping the appalling hours they do.

"This is an antique stereotype, though unfortunately still strongly supported by evidence and opinion. A new breed is being developed, however; the theatre devotee to be found not only *in* the spotlight, but *behind* it. It is he who may suffer from vertigo and yet stands on top of a high ladder burning his fingers. He may have asthma but there he is in a damp basement seeking an appropriate prop for a realistic play. He is scared to death of animals but it is he who ministers to the dog or pig or horse or goat, depending on the show. And when he acts, he is petrified with nervousness, but do the non-theatre people suspect it? No!

"Perhaps the distinguishing feature between the theatre man and the non-theatre man lies in a question that is often asked, meaningful to the one, absolutely without meaning to the other. The question is, "Which night did you see the show?" To the outsider, a play is a play. It has the same story night after night, the same scenery, and the actors are saying the same lines—more or less. What's the difference which night I saw it? But those to whom the question makes sense and the answer casts into rapture or despair, they are in—they belong. In all else, this new type of theatre man is not to be distinguished from a mailman or a plumber. He keeps the drama out of his private and social life and directs it toward the performance, where it belongs. At all other times he quietly and efficiently goes about his business."

SHOP TALK CALENDAR

Speech Association of America, American Forensic Association, National Society for the Study of Communication, Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials: Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, December 27-29, 1956. Some committee, council, and assembly meetings on December 26. American Educational Theatre Association, same place, Dec. 28-30

Central States Speech Association: Hotel Sherman, Chicago, April 6-7. Two 1957 dates have been announced: Hotel Leamington, Minneapolis, April 5-6; Hotel Sherman, Chicago, December 27-28.

Southern Speech Association: Forrest Hotel, Hattiesburg, Miss., April 2-7.

Speech Association of the Eastern States: Hotel Statler, New York, April 12-14.

(Secretaries of other organizations are invited to list their convention dates in Shop Talk's calendar.)

Other conventions for the Speech Association of America are now scheduled as follows:

1957: Hotel Statler, Boston, August 25-28.
1958: Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, December 29-31.
1959: Hotel Statler, Washington, December 28-30.
1960: The Jefferson, St. Louis, December 28-30.
1961: Hotel Statler, New York, December.
1962: Hotel Cleveland, Cleveland, December.

ADD TO YOUR UNIT on conversation. A father, says the *Journal* of the American Medical Association, listened to his teenage daughter gabbing to a friend on the phone. He waited until she finished and then called to her.

"Honey," he said, "there are a couple of words you use constantly that I consider very unlady-like. Will you try to stop using them? One is 'okay' and the other is 'crummy.'"

"I'll sure try, daddy," answered his daughter. "What are the words?"

CURRICULAR DEVELOPMENTS. Effective at the beginning of the current semester, Ripon College will institute a major field of study in the

Department of Speech. Howard C. Hansen, associate professor of speech at Ripon, is largely responsible for the new development. . . . A department of theatre arts has been established at the Pennsylvania State University as a part of the new School of Fine and Applied Arts. Formerly dramatics was a part of the program of the department of English literature. Walter H. Walters, assistant professor of dramatics, is acting head of the new department. . . . Joseph E. Wright is chairman of a newly-created department of speech and drama at Vanderbilt University.

Boston University has expanded its course offerings in speech pathology and audiology, and has established a teaching affiliation with the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Memorial Hospital for the Rehabilitation of the Physically and Mentally Handicapped. . . . New upperclass and graduate courses in TV are being added to the offerings of the Department of Speech at the University of Missouri. Under the direction of Robert Haakenson, students are participating in a variety of radio and TV programs, not only locally, but over stations throughout the state. . . . The Wisconsin School of Journalism and the Department of Speech are offering a seminar in Communications Research Design. The course, dealing with methods of research, is currently given by Malcolm MacLean of the Journalism staff. The Extension Division is conducting an experimental non-credit course in public speaking at the Wisconsin Home for Women, a correction institution at Taycheedah. Herman H. Brockhaus, the instructor, conducts some sessions personally, and comments by mail on tape recordings of speeches made at other sessions. . . . The Colorado School of Mines is now preparing to revive radio broadcasting over KCOM. Pat M. Ryan of the Department of English and Modern Foreign Languages and Scott Marshall of the Department of Electrical Engineering are heading up faculty support of the venture.

IF YOU SEEK new ideas for TV programs, consider these: KUTH, the educational television station of the University of Houston, telecasts the bi-monthly meetings of the Houston Independent School Board. John C. Schwarzwalder is chairman of the department at Houston; on the TV staff are Tom C. Battin and Paul Owen. . . . The University of Wisconsin Forensic Union is presenting, semi-weekly, a television program, "Quiz the Professor." . . . WKAR, the Michigan State University TV station, has begun a series of programs designed to help young people choose a career. The title of the series is "If I Were 17," with Glen Smith as moderator.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY Summer Travel Courses will sponsor a tour of facilities in Europe for the education of exceptional children during the summer of 1956. Visits will be made to hospital schools, special schools, clinics and special education departments, including schools for the crippled, mentally retarded, blind, deaf, hard of hearing, speech handicapped and intellectually gifted. Tentative plans cover fifty-eight days in Europe. Six semester credits will be given.

The tour price, figured tentatively at $861.00, will be directed by Wilbert Pronovost, chairman of the Committee on Special Education and Director of the Speech and Hearing Center.

MOST UNUSUAL Christmas greeting that landed on Shop Talk's desk was from F. Kenneth and Margaret Ann Brasted, long known to speech teachers who inhabit public speaking, forensic, business, and N.A.M. circles. Dr. Brasted is now the president of the University of Dallas, a new educational venture still in the making. The front of the greeting, entitled "A President's Dream," opens up on a picture of Texas sagebrush country labelled "Site of University of Dallas" and sprinkled with residence halls and a science building of modern design. The greeting goes on to say that ground is now being broken for three brand-new buildings, and that faculty and students will meet for the first time next September. We want to anoint the new University of Dallas with best wishes from Shop Talk, and hope that the new president's dream goes to include a TV tower, a theatre, and an auditorium.

THE AMERICAN SPEECH and Hearing Association met at Los Angeles just before Thanksgiving. Our scouts report a fine convention, with a good program and an attendance of about 1100.

Charlotte G. Wells, director of the Speech and Hearing Clinic at Missouri, reports that the clerks at the Statler became fond of ASHA people, and that she was asked for more information about that association. The clerk listened intently to Dr. Wells's account, and then said: "Well, I want you to know that you folks are the nicest people we have ever had here, except for the morticians." Sounds like an honest, solid compliment.

AN INTERESTING SERIES of Speech Assembly programs has been arranged for the students of the Department of Speech of Michigan during the fall semester. They were as follows: a speech by William Oncken, chief, Training and Development Division, Department of the Army, Washington, D. C.; Edgar DeWitt Jones of Detroit, speaking on Abraham Lincoln; a demonstration of the production of a radio dramatic script; and a group of lecture-readings entitled "They Said It Well" by Lamont Okey of the Department of Speech, University of Michigan. In addition, the first of a series of programs intended for those students who may not be concentrating in Speech, was presented on October 27. Produced by members of the TV staff, the program is entitled: "Back-stage with TV; Lights, Cameras, and Action in a Demonstration of TV Drama."

A SEARCHING EXAMINATION of what has been accomplished in the American theatre during the first half of the 20th century is being undertaken by Princeton University with a series of public lectures by distinguished men of the theatre, complementary exhibitions in the University Library and special dramatic events in the Princeton community. The six-months long program was conceived by Alan S. Downer, associate professor of English and authority in the field of the modern American drama. The University Library also opened a major exhibition devoted to documenting the "revolution that has enabled the American drama to take its place among the theatres of the world."

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN Speech Clinic has expanded its out-patient services through the division of Speech Correction Services under the auspices of the Dean of the Medical School and the Department of Otolaryngology. Quarters assigned to the staff of the Speech Clinic are located in the new Out-Patient Clinic of the University Hospital in the Pediatrics area. This division provides diagnostic and consultational services to the medical clinics of the hospital.

Residential quarters have been provided in connection with the Speech Clinic Dysphasia Division through the cooperation of the University Service Enterprises. The dysphasia program is operated as one of the six instructional laboratory divisions of the Clinic. Therapy is provided five days a week on an intensive, full-day program for twenty patients per semester. The living quarters have made possible a type of experimentation and instruction which greatly extends the language therapy program.

The 1955 Summer Session featured the Examining Institute including a series of lectures by guest lecturers from other universities and from various disciplines of the University of Michigan faculties. The topics dealt with the methods and diagnosis of the various disorders of speech. During the 1956 Summer Session plans are being formulated to continue the Institute. The subject will deal with various aspects of speech therapy.

THIS STORY COMES from the sunny Southland. A girl taking an advanced course in public address kept quoting Aristotle to her landlady. "That Aristotle certainly sounds like a nice fellow," the landlady finally said. "Why don't you bring him around some time?"

THE FALL MEETING of the Connecticut Speech and Hearing Association was held October 28 at the Milford High School. The program was a symposium on "The Speech Teacher's Part in the Program for Mentally Retarded Children." Participating in this symposium were E. Louise Porter of the Southbury Training School; William McDermott of Greenwich; and Gerald Woolf of Stamford. Officers of the Connecticut Speech and Hearing Association for 1955-56 are: Gladdy Lou Thomas, Greenwich, president; Val Chevron, Stratford, vice-president; Hilda Amidon, Hartford, program chairman; Kathryn Keller, New Haven, secretary; Dennis Ellsworth, Fairfield, treasurer; Florence Lewis, consultant; Geraldine Garrison, consultant.

THE FOURTH ANNUAL conference on Speech Communication in Business and Industry was conducted by the Department of Speech of the University of Michigan on June 27 and 28. Forty representatives from fifteen industries and organizations took part in the two-day training conference. Staff members of the Department who assisted in the training meetings included Hayden K. Carruth, G. E. Densmore, N. Edd Miller, L. Lamont Okey, William M. Sattler, Alfred W. Storey, Edgar E. Willis, and Edward Stasheff.

THE SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF THE EASTERN STATES has scheduled its annual meeting April 12-14 at the Hotel Statler in New York City. A program in all areas is being prepared and professional round tables are being established to provide convention participants with an opportunity to meet and discuss common problems and solutions in various areas. The tentative outline for the round tables is as follows:

College Speech Clinics, Eleanor Luse, University of Vermont; Departmental and Administrative Problems, James Henning, University of West Virginia; Directors of Graduate Studies, Wilbur Gilman, Queens; Elementary School Speech, Helen Donovan, New York City Bureau of Speech Improvement; Forensics, Wofford Gardner, University of Maine; Public School Speech and Hearing Correctionists, Geraldine Garrison, Connecticut.

THE DEATH IN NOVEMBER of Dale Carnegie will call up many memories among subscribers of *QJS*. Every teacher of speech in the country has heard him speak, or has heard about or has read one or more of his books. Many taught classes for his organization. His methods have been discussed at national SAA conventions.

His best book was *Public Speaking and Influencing Men in Business*, although most readers know him by *How to Win Friends and Influence People*. When Carnegie visited the campus of the state university of his home state, Missouri, a few years ago, he told the members of the speech department who gathered for a short discussion with him how he conceived the book without having much hope for a good market. The publishers agreed with him, and launched it in an edition of modest size. Eventually it sold nearly five million copies. No one, declared Carnegie, was more astonished than the author himself.

THE ANNUAL NATIONAL CONTEST in public discussion is being conducted by Wayne N. Thompson and Lenore Evans, of the Chicago Undergraduate Division, University of Illinois. This contest is open to all universities, colleges, and junior colleges in the United States. It is conducted by tape recording and deals with the national question. Each college entering prepares a tape of twenty-five minutes and ships the tape to a designated judging center. The 1954-1955 contest attracted thirty-three entries and was won by the University of Texas, with the University of Houston second, and Los Angeles State College third. W. Norwood Brigance, John Keltner, and Kenneth G. Hance judged the finals.

MCMURRAY'S FORENSICS PROGRAM, revived two years ago, enters its first full year in 1955-56, with a Forensics Club of more than twenty members, an eight-tournament debate program for the twelve-man debate team, and a Speakers Bureau of six individual speeches, a symposium forum group, and an exhibition debate on the NFL question. McMurry's Tau Kappa Alpha charter was reactivated last year after a 25-year lapse.

MEMPHIS STATE COLLEGE co-operated during the spring and summer with the National Parks Department in acting the roles for a motion picture entitled "Shiloh: Portrait of a Battle." Nineteen students and faculty members spent several week-ends on location at the Shiloh National Park.

BRADLEY UNIVERSITY announces the opening of a new Speech Clinic House on the campus. During the summer a university-owned residence was extensively remodelled to house the clinic. The new clinic house has observation and therapy rooms, a classroom, an acoustical room, as well as a conference room and offices. C. K. Mawhinney is director of the new Speech Clinic and Bernice Tuell is supervising clinician. Formal dedication of the new clinic house was on October 27. The dedication was followed by Open House which was sponsored by Sigma Alpha Eta.

A SPEECH CONFERENCE for teachers of high school speech activity, and play, radio, debate, and individual events directors, was held on October 8 on the campus of Ohio Northern University at Ada. The theme of the conference was: "How To" (Select a play. Stage a play. Enter the league. Produce radio programs. Coach debate). and "Where To" (Get materials. Ideas. Assistance). Guest lecturers were: Harold Obee, Community Play Service, Bowling Green State University; Don Olin, Children's Theatre Director, Ohio State University; Doyle Smith, Theatre Director, Ohio Northern University; J. T. Rickey, Director OHSSL, Ohio State University; Easter Straker, Program Director, Public Service Station WIMA, Iima; Harold Niven, WOIO Supervisor, Ohio State University.

THE ORAL INTERPRETATION TAPE EXCHANGE now has on hand the following tape recordings of readings from literature:

Gravediggers' Scene, Hamlet, read by Lee Emerson Bassett, professor emeritus, Stanford University.

"The Schoolteacher," a recital, including poems by Jeffers, Sandburg, Cummings, Fearing, and Eliot, read by Janet Bolton, Occidental College.

"A Nightmare Sequence," poems by Stephen Vincent Benet, read by Ruth Dougherty, student at San Jose State College.

Enoch Arden, read by Leonard Ecker, student at Michigan State College.

English and Scottish Ballads (10 tapes), read by Gordon Emmerson, San Jose State College.

Dramatic readings from Shakespeare, Browning, and others, read by Frederic Hilo, Morningside College.

Poem of Edith Sitwell, read by Ray Irwin, Syracuse University.

"Love's Courage," a lecture recital on the Browning letters, read by Sara Lowrey, Furman University.

"Two Hemispheres," a lecture recital on the theme of man's environment and man's religions, read by Joyce Osborn, student at San Jose State College.

A. E. Housman, a lecture recital, read by Garff Wilson, University of California.

To obtain any of these tapes, mail a blank tape with return postage to: SAA Tape Exchange, c/o L. H. Mouat, San Jose State College, San Jose 14, California. A dubbing will be sent to you immediately. You are cordially invited to send a tape of your own to add to the Exchange Library. Send a single track, half-hour tape (7.5 inches) of a selection (or selections) read by yourself, your colleague, or your students.

MEMPHIS STATE COLLEGE will present three performances of *Rumpelstiltskin* in its newly-established Children's Theatre. The actors will be college students and the audience will be children in the first, second, and third grades. The production will be presented in the college theatre.

TODAY'S SPEECH, a relatively new journal published by the Speech Association of the Eastern States, is certainly worth a good look.

About three years ago that association decided to change the editorial policy of its official publication and come out with a journal having a somewhat different tone. The new publication, called *Today's Speech*, was, at the outset, aimed at a fairly large readership, ranging from undergraduate speech students and business and professional men whose interest in speaking was chiefly utilitarian, to teachers actively engaged in instruction. Scholarly articles were not to be ignored, but the emphasis was to be placed on articles that would interpret principles of good speech in non-technical language. Or so the editorial purpose seems to us; we write the above without any coaching.

We did, however, ask editor Robert T. Oliver of Penn State University for a few specific details concerning the publication. He says that *Today's Speech* now has 450 readers in the Speech Association of the Eastern States, is required reading in beginning speech classes in fifteen colleges, and is subscribed to by business and professional men and women, by SAA members, by college and high school libraries, and by industrial personnel and training directors. The circulation now is 3,800, the list having increased by more than 500 during the last summer.

The problems faced by the editor and his associates, and the contributors, must be tremendous. The art of being clear calls for a certain amount of simplification, whereas the speech arts and sciences are matters of formidable complexity. The scholar is often so busy with his researches that he does not have the time, or the inclination, to write for those outside his specialty. Yet those outsiders do not have the patience to follow the complete line of reasoning, and might not even understand it if they could. To reach the outsiders, the scholar needs to simplify freely and generalize broadly; at the same time he needs to protect himself carefully, or he will be shushed at by other scholars.

Today's Speech is apparently trying to enlist the help of the experts in preparing articles for a large, interested group of students, teachers, and laymen. It seems not to be interested in announcing that speech is easy, or that speech is good fun, or that speech is the way to prosperity. It seems also not to be interested in technical monographs, short or long. We believe it does as good a job of hewing to the center line as we have yet seen.

THE NINTH ANNUAL Freshman-Sophomore Debate Tournament was held at the Chicago Undergraduate Division, University of Illinois, Saturday, December 10. The annual tournament for high schools was held January 7. Wayne N. Thompson directs the college meet, and Carl A. Pitt has charge of the high school event.

FIGURES RECENTLY COMPILED on enrollment in all Missouri colleges gives a fair idea of what is happening all over the country.

Freshman classes in Missouri in 1955 represent approximately one-third of the total college enrollment. At present there are 16,583 college freshmen, compared with a total enrollment of 47,832. The young men and women making up the first-year classes today were

born during the low birth rate years of 1937-39; so their presence in college in large numbers means that a larger percentage of high school graduates than formerly is seeking a higher education.

The upswing in the birth rate is represented by the present class of high school freshmen.

The first big impact of this group will be in September, 1959, when the twin factors of increasing birth rate and increasing interest in going to college will both make themselves felt in enrollment figures.

Here is the total picture: Of Missouri's 47,832 students, 16,583 are freshmen, 10,880 are sophomores, 6,590 are juniors, 5,589 are seniors, 3,727 are in graduate schools, 3,523, are in professional schools, and 950 are special or unclassified.

A RESEARCH INVESTIGATION in speech therapy for retarded children is being launched jointly by the National Hospital for Speech Disorders and the New York University School of Education. The six-month study will be under the direction of Howard Newburger, associate professor at New York University and secretary-treasurer of the American Society of Group Psychotherapy and Psychodrama, and his wife, Doris Newburger, speech therapist at National Hospital. Approximately 75 children, ranging in age from 7 to 15 years will participate in the study.

NOTES FROM STANFORD'S CLINIC: Two new speech correction internships have been established at the Stanford University Speech and Hearing Clinic, supported through grants from United Cerebral Palsy of Peninsula Cities and from the Polio Foundation. Both involve work with physically handicapped children and adults; approximately half-time salaries are provided and opportunities are afforded for close co-operation with the medical staffs.

A new group, the Army Daughters, has come in to join those already sponsoring the Stanford University Speech and Hearing Clinic, which includes the Junior League, and the peninsula chapter of Kappa Alpha Theta. The Army Daughters volunteer their time and services in working at the Clinic and in the preparation of teaching and clinical materials.

The United Cerebral Palsy of Peninsula Cities is sponsoring a service and training project at the Clinic this year, involving therapy for some fifteen cerebral palsied children and the addition of a new staff member to direct the program and teach a special course dealing with speech and language problems in cerebral palsy. Three clinical assistantships are provided under the grant.

Stanford has organized a new program in English language training for foreign students, which combines in one course both the written and oral aspects of the training. The series of courses is under the Department of Speech and Drama with Dorothy Huntington in charge.

READERS OF SCIENCE FICTION may be interested in knowing that phonemics has provided materials for a story in the May, 1955, issue of *Astounding Science Fiction*. The story is by Charles F. Hockett and is entitled, "How to Learn Martian." If this reference ever gets on the outside reading list of a phonetics course, it will prove popular.

NEW HORIZONS in Speech Education" was the theme of the twelfth annual Speech Conference held at Geneseo State Teachers College, May 6. Principal speakers were: Yetta Mitchell, president of the New York State Speech Association, "Why Speech?"; Evelyn Konigsberg, assistant director, Bureau of Speech Improvement, New York City, "Speech in the Language Arts Program"; and E. DeAlton Partridge, president of the Montclair State Teachers College, Montclair, N. J., "Television in Education." Cothurnus, the college dramatic club, presented "Ladies in Retirement" as the final feature of the conference. C. Agnes Rigney, chairman of the speech department at Geneseo, was general chairman.

A SIMPLE TEST to detect poor hearing in pre-school-age children has been devised and administered by the University of Denver Hearing Center. The test, the first of its kind ever attempted in the United States on a large scale, will discover hearing difficulties in pre-school-age children, enabling the child to be treated before entering school.

As a part of the test, each child is asked to identify familiar sounds such as a dog bark, a car horn, cat's meow, bird song, telephone, etc. The sounds are presented on a phonograph record and each includes only selected pitch ranges.

BOWLING GREEN (Ohio) State University's Station WBGU-FM, under the auspices of the Department of Speech has, during the last year, engaged in its most ambitious program to date. This includes building and taping an extended series of educational programs by faculty members for broadcast over Fort Wayne,

Indiana's, commercial station WOWO. Occasional broadcasts have been presented over WLW Cincinnati, as well as over Toledo and Cleveland stations. Some of these programs have been televised. The enterprise is under the direction of Sidney Stone and his staff of graduate and technical assistants.

THE EXTENSION DIVISION of the University of Oklahoma has published a revised Handbook of the *Oklahoma High School Speech League*. James Robinson, director of Oklahoma Speech and Drama Services, prepared the revision, which is designed to be of special help to new teachers, and in general to increase the educational value of interschool speech activities.

THE DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH at Ohio State was a co-sponsor of a conference on Communication Research and Training in Business and Industry, held at Columbus on November 18. On the program were Franklin H. Knower and Raymond Ross of Ohio State, and Buell Whitehill, director of personnel of the Rust Engineering Company, Pittsburgh.

A USEFUL NEW PUBLICATION is *Doctors' Dissertations and Masters' Theses on the Education of the Deaf*, covering the period 1897 to 1955, found in the September, 1955, issue of the *American Annals of the Deaf*.

THEATRE SCHEDULES

Arkansas State College: *Androcles and the Lion, The Great God Brown.*

Brooklyn College: Brooklyn Community Children's Theatre: *The Emperor's New Clothes, Master Skylark, Amahl and the Night Visitors, Play and Dance, Beauty and the Beast, Puss in Boots, Toby Tyler and the Circus.* Department of Speech: *Puss in Boots.* Light Opera Guild: *Amahl and the Night Visitors.* Modern Dance Club: *Play and Dance.*

Butler University: School of Religion: *The Servant in the House.*

Jefferson City, Missouri, Little Theatre: *The Late Christopher Bean.*

Kansas State College: *My Three Angels, Aladdin and the Wonderful Lamp, Major Ogden, Amphitryon 38.* Student-directed one-act plays: *Aria da Capo, Opera, Opera, Red Peppers, Yes Is For a Very Young Man, The Cave of Salamanca, Ten Blocks on the Camina Real.*

Oklahoma A. and M. College: *Antigone.*

University of Missouri Musical: *Wish You Were Here.* Missouri Workshop Theatre: *The Hasty Heart.*

Purdue University: *The Fourposter, Dark of the Moon, Picnic, Othello,* and a series of experimental one-acts.

University of Oregon: *Fancy Meeting You Again, Balloon, Impressario, Reclining Figure, Green Valley.*

Temple University: *The Importance of Being Earnest, Phaedre, Romeo and Juliet, La Parisienne.* One-act plays: *One Day More, The Monkey's Paw, Suppressed Desires, Everyman, Many Moons, The Second Shepard's Play.* TV drama: *Agamemnon, Antigone.*

University of Wisconsin: Wisconsin Players and WHA-TV: *Premiere, The Search, The Hill District.*

Yale University: Yale Dramatic Association: *The Miracle of St. Anthony, A Happy Journey from Trenton to Camden, The Gamblers* (one-act plays).

APPOINTMENTS

Arlington County, Virginia, Public Schools: Jean C. Ervin, supervisor of speech education.

Boston University: Phyllis Goldberg, therapist and clinical assistant.

Los Angeles City College: Glenn Gooder, interpretation and public speaking; Harold Bargelt, director of the speech clinic.

Long Beach State College: John H. Green, associate professor of speech.

Mountain View, California, Schools: Betty Cochran Kirtland, speech therapist.

Northwestern State College (Alva, Okla.): Robert A. McCormick, chairman of the Department of Speech.

Purdue University: Mason A. Hicks, associate professor of speech; W. Charles Redding, associate professor of speech; Robert P. Friedman, Lowell Matson, assistant professors of speech; Frank E. Funk, Darrell Piersol, instructors in speech; Hal B. Merrell, supervisor of the public school hearing test service; Alfred Albrecht, Steven Buck, W. Scott Curtis, Allan B. Drexler, Brenice Grodman, Frank Hancock, Alice Lowder, Mary V. McDonald, Edward Mysak, Joan T. Nakamura, Allan Richards, Seymour Rigrodsky, John Sills, Bertram Thorne, graduate assistants in speech.

Temple University: Lois Craig, Hace Tishler, instructors in speech; Alice Peet, instructor in speech and dramatics.

University of North Dakota: Myron M. Curry, assistant professor and director of radio;